THE

CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Nº. CXXXIX. *April* 1910.

Art. I.—A NEW HISTORY OF METHODISM.

1. *A New History of Methodism.* Edited by W. J. Townsend, D.D., H. B. Workman, M.A., D.Lit., and George Eayrs, F.R.Hist.S. Two Volumes. (London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1909.)
2. *The Journal of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M., sometime Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford.* Enlarged from original MSS., with notes from unpublished Diaries, Annotations, Maps, and Illustrations. By Nehemiah Curnock, assisted by Experts. Standard Edition. Vol. I. (London: R. Culley. 1909.)
3. *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century.* By R. Abbey and J. H. Overton. Two Volumes. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1875.)
4. *The Life of Wesley and the Rise and Progress of Methodism.* By R. Southey. (London: G. Bell and Sons. 1901.)
5. *Life and Times of Wesley.* By L. Tyerman. Sixth Edition. (London. 1890.)
6. *Susanna Wesley.* By E. Clarke. Third Edition. (London: Gibbings and Co. Ltd. 1909.)
7. *Encyclopædia Britannica.* Ninth Edition. Article 'Methodism.' By J. H. Rigg. (London: A. and C. Black. 1875.)
8. *Sermons on Several Occasions.* By John Wesley. Two Volumes. (London. 1825.)

And many other Works

LOYALTY to the common founder has always been a characteristic of the different bodies of Methodists, and a bond of union between them. It shews itself in a devout acquisitiveness which has given a market price to the memorials in print or pottery of early Methodism, destitute of any interest save that of association and pathetically void of beauty as they are. It has raised his resorts in England to places of pilgrimage, and we are assured by his admirers that among the American Methodists who visit Oxford many are chiefly attracted by Lincoln College with its memories of Wesley. It has concentrated a laborious curiosity upon the fortunes of the Wesley family, even those of its obscurer members, which may compare with the energy expended in research concerning Shakespeare. In fact, there is no figure of the eighteenth century in regard to whom we are so well informed save Dr. Johnson; and what in the latter case was accomplished once for all by a man of genius who was a personal friend, in the former is due to the minute labours of a multitude of conscientious antiquaries, though the title does not give a just description of men whose most vivid interests and hopes are bound up with the life of their hero. Among these antiquaries—the name in his case is especially appropriate, for his patience, his exactness, and ingenuity would have won him honour in any field of antiquarian inquiry—Mr. Nehemiah Curnock holds a foremost place. The governing body of the Wesleyan Methodists have been well advised in giving what is, we suppose, their official sanction to his 'standard edition' of John Wesley's Journals. The work is to extend to six volumes, and if the unpublished five are worthy companions of the first, they will be an indispensable source for the history, general as well as religious, of the eighteenth century.

Mr. Curnock's task has not been an easy one. There are problems concerning the text of the Journal which are complicated by the further light cast by the Diaries which he is the first to give in substance to the world. The student of the standard edition must make his way through three tiers of print, in three different types. The Journal, printed

in full, is followed by copious extracts from the Diary, interspersed with abundant, and sometimes too abundant, comment and elucidation, which overflow into the smaller type of the annotations. Mr. Curnock's task has been so unusual that it is almost unfair to criticize its execution; but a little more method in arrangement, and a little reticence in the drawing of obvious morals and contrasts would have improved his work. It is not his fault that in the interpretation of Wesley's cryptic Diary, sometimes abbreviated to the utmost, and sometimes expressed in various tentative shorthands, he has not always been successful. It was the writer's purpose to baffle curiosity, and the editor, even with his expert advisers' help, has often enough been outwitted. The facsimile pages which he gives are his sufficient excuse, and we have no reason to think that Wesley's ingenuity has concealed from him any facts of interest or importance. But there is one wide field of Wesley's thought which he would have been pained to find deserted by his modern adherents. His Prayer Book was his constant companion and guide; and Mr. Curnock's explanations of its contents and arrangements are so constant and so elementary that we are forced to believe it a sealed book to the mass of his expected readers. No doubt Mr. Curnock himself is familiar with it, but there are many points where his notes reveal the fact that he is not at home, as a Wesleyan of former days would have been, in his founder's Church. At one time he will explain the obvious, at another he will fall into such misapprehensions as those of an Oxford man essaying to explain the intimate details of Cambridge life. The consequences are not serious, and if we are sorry it is rather for his want of initiation than for our own loss of instruction; or rather we are instructed as to the drift from its old associations of Modern Methodism.

To Wesley himself the attachment of the Wesleyans is close as ever, and his characteristics and those of his family have left an indelible stamp upon them. He was, indeed, one of the most impressive of men. No aspect of life was uninteresting to him; his only repugnance was to indifference and indolence. He had great social gifts, and as a

young man, his interest in religion being already as keen as in later life, he shared in the enjoyments of his age and class. He danced and hunted and played tennis, and was a popular member of general society. He read widely in literature, both ancient and modern, though his curious want of humour must have blunted his appreciation of much that he read. He was a keen observer of natural phenomena, and interested in practical affairs. His notes on the agriculture and topography of Georgia must be among the most important evidences for the beginning of that Colony. He was a good man of business; when his poetical brother, Charles, appointed to act as secretary to General Oglethorpe, broke down in health after proving his inefficiency for the post, John Wesley undertook it with success, fulfilling the laborious task without any diminution of his spiritual toil on behalf of the settlers. It was the same in later life. No man was ever more widely interested or more universally competent; nor, it must be added, more confident in his own abilities—a confidence that in the main was justified by success.

Labours so unsparing could only be maintained by one with a strong sense of responsibility. That it was cherished by Wesley is made manifest by the Diary, from which extracts are now published for the first time. He began it before his ordination as a record of duties performed. The record is of extraordinary fullness; even his brief intervals of prayer, five or six minutes in each successive hour throughout the day, are scrupulously entered. His whole work, even his lighter reading, is taken with equal seriousness; in his eyes nothing was unimportant. He had learned from his parents, and especially from his strenuous mother, to take an extraordinary interest, in a good sense, in himself. It is evident that she believed, and with sufficient reason, that hers was a remarkable family. Everything that occurred to them was worthy of commemoration, and there grew up among them a habit of exchanging with each other a precise account of their experiences in action or thought. John Wesley would make several copies of such a narrative to be transmitted to his relations; and

there can be no doubt that the mutual confidences of the early Methodists, which bound their societies together in a bond of peculiar closeness, had their origin in this idiosyncrasy of the Wesley household.

But persons whose experience was thus habitually recorded must inevitably come to attach to it a great importance. The mother of the Wesleys was not the woman to encourage a spirit of mutual admiration in her family. But the persistent recording of deeds and thoughts which could almost always be honestly approved by sincere critics must have stamped upon resolute minds the conviction that their own judgement could be trusted; and this was the result with John Wesley. For better, and sometimes for worse, he acquired a serene assurance that what he did was right. We see this unattractively displayed in his successive phases of religious thought. So far as his own spiritual welfare was concerned, we can see no advance from his earliest years to his final conviction. His faith did not change, though his opinions about his faith did. In each stage he was convinced that he was right, and he earnestly pressed his conviction upon all within his range of influence. His progress was in the power of influencing others, and in that respect there is certainly an extraordinary advance. As his views changed, his evangelistic powers progressively expanded; and though practical result is not a perfect test of doctrinal validity, it must be taken into full account in the framing of the verdict. But in Wesley's case the assurance that the new phase represented truth was accompanied by a violent breach not only with the earlier thought, but also with the masters to whom he had hitherto been attached by bonds of gratitude and affection. Mr. Curnock has been the first to publish the earliest instance of this unamiable spirit. After taking his degree at Oxford, Wesley became intimate with a circle of clerical families, evidently of refined piety and literary tastes, in Gloucestershire. They corresponded, after the fashion of the day, under assumed names, Aspasia, Araspes, Cyrus, and the like. Among them was a Miss Betty Kirkham, daughter of the Rector of Stanton, near

Winchcombe. Under the name of Varanese she conducted a correspondence with Wesley, so intimate that Mr. Curnock conjectures a disappointment on the lady's part that it ended in letters. She seems to have introduced him to the *Imitation of Christ* and exercised an influence upon him so strong that he speaks of it thus: 'Meeting likewise with a religious friend, which I never had till now, I began to alter the whole form of my conversation, and to set in earnest upon a new life.' Yet the change is imperceptible; in his later days Wesley would certainly have regarded his religious life before and after his intimacy with Miss Kirkham as equally rudimentary and unprofitable. And this novelty of religious friendship was enjoyed by one who had lived from infancy in the closest harmony with Susanna Wesley, and was for many years to give her his confidence.[1] If this were a solitary instance it would obviously be unfair to dwell upon it. But within a few years Wesley fell under the influence of William Law, and felt for him, very justly, a strong admiration. Indeed, Law was to have, as both friends and foes have asserted, a formative effect upon Methodism. It might have seemed that the admiration was too firmly rooted to be disturbed. But presently Wesley fell into the company of the Moravians, and came to value them as they deserved. At once he was off with the old love, and wrote his famous letter of expostulation to Law, which met with so crushing a retort from that master of controversy, who advised him 'not to be hasty in believing that because you change your language and expressions you have changed your faith.' And eighteen years later, in 1756, Wesley repeated his condemnation of Law's teaching, in what Whitefield described as 'a most unchristian and ungentlemanlike letter.' Whitefield was prone to exaggeration, and not an impartial witness; but Wesley's dealings with Law do not redound to his credit.

[1] It is not unfair to state that Charles Wesley shared this peculiarity with his brother. In the *Dictionary of National Biography*, (*s.v.* Wesley, Samuel), Mr. A. Gordon writes: 'A poetical epitaph by Charles Wesley implies that his mother had not known true religion before her seventieth year.'

Yet after all his public repudiation of Law does not represent his true thought: repeatedly in his teaching he mentions him with praise, and encourages his followers in the study of Law's works. Nor was this the last open change on Wesley's part. The turn of the Moravians was to come, and they were to be treated as cavalierly. As usual, Wesley was quite sure that the last phase was the final truth. But his heart was better than his head, and late in life he reverted in desire to those Oxford days, when Miss Kirkham was his religious friend, and compared his later state regretfully with his earlier. Truly, as one of his admirers, quoted by Mr. Curnock, says: 'Wesley was no martyr to the bugbear of consistency.'

From all this we must draw a conclusion as to the value of Wesley's judgement, which will not be inconsistent with a high admiration of his genius and his devotion, and which will even increase our sense of his organizing capacity. When he came to shape the constitution of his society, he was as sure that his theory, borrowed from Lord Chancellor King, was true, as he had been that each of his successive religious guides was a teacher of higher truths than his predecessor. Perhaps he might, had his life been prolonged and the influences surrounding him changed, have repudiated King's theory as abruptly as he rejected the doctrine of Law. But we know that, even as things were, he was inconsistent. There is a famous sermon, too much advertised by Wesley's critics, and somewhat unwisely kept in the background by his followers, which cannot be reconciled with the Lord Chancellor's teaching. Apostolic earnestness and extraordinary efficiency in administration were not, in Wesley's case, accompanied by clearness of thought; and if his mind did not harbour incompatible views at the same moment, at any rate somewhere in his writings we shall find him contradicting himself. In a busy life he found no time for deliberate thought, and helpfulness was his test of truth. The fact that the characteristic doctrine of his maturity liberated fresh forces and made him an incomparable evangelist, was for him its sufficient proof; and the evident need of a working organization convinced him,

at any rate for the time, that a convenient hypothesis must be a true one. This practical bent of Wesley's mind has led his followers into a serious difficulty. Pledged as they are to adherence to his personal teaching, they must either explain much of it away as plausibly as they can, or else must attempt a task beyond their mental agility.[1] The latter, unfortunately, is their usual case. Methodist writers are apt to pour the most lavish praise upon Wesley's temporary companions, so long as their master consorted with them; and suddenly, when the breach has come, to discover how imperfect was the Christianity on which, a few pages back, their laudation was bestowed. Of this spirit, neither logical nor amiable, there are too many examples in the large *History of Methodism* which is before us.

But, as we have said, Wesley's efficiency as an evangelist was not lessened, but rather increased, by his mental developments; and the same assertion must be made in regard to his achievements in organization. Gifts such as his were, indeed, sorely needed in the England of his day. We should be sorry to think that Wesleyans in general regard the eighteenth century with the eyes of the Rev. W. J. Townsend, to whom has been entrusted the preliminary chapter of description in their history. That gentleman has flamboyant rhetoric, and no historical sense. He has picked out the darker features of the time, some of which were much less dark than he would have them. He has read diligently, but has not qualified himself to interpret what he has read by making acquaintance either with the permanent realities of human nature or with the facts of the eighteenth century. His styling the Chancellor of William III 'Lord John Somers' is a small but very characteristic error. But grotesque as his picture of society and education is, it contains the elements of truth, if only they were given their right setting and proportion; and we cannot help regretting that Dr. Workman, a scholar

[1] It should be noticed that sermons of Wesley's, composed before his final conversion, are included among those which form the Methodist standard of doctrine.

and a thinker, was not allowed to revise those unhappy pages. In fact, it was not the vices or the misery of the age that called for a reformer, but its general tone. As Puritanism had been the inevitable reaction from the secular ambitions and the enjoyment of life in the Elizabethan age, so the Latitudinarianism and Deism of the eighteenth century was a reaction against the doctrinal emphasis of both Puritan and Caroline teaching. The comfortable teaching of the early Georgian period, when Dissenters and Churchmen were equally disposed to dwell upon the surface of life, provoked in its turn a revival of the sense of sin; and of that revival Wesley was the most effective spokesman. He was so far a man of his age that he was no mystic; on the other hand the rebound from sceptical tendencies was shewn in his superstition, as it may not unfairly be called. There may have been in it an unconscious Laudianism, derived from his father, but Wesley's attention to coincidences and special providences as far exceeds Laud's as that of Laud advances beyond the playful interest of Archbishop Benson in similar accidents. We find this, like so many other traits of Wesley, reproduced in his successors; naturally enough in America, always more conservative than Europe in matters of religion.[1]

Another characteristic of Wesley and his age was patriotism and the cult of efficiency. It was a time of great material progress, which had no doubt a dark side that was to increase in blackness as the factory system grew; but the increase of wealth and of diffused comfort was more conspicuous under Walpole than the attendant misery. It is no accident that Wesleyans have had their full share in the prosperity, and that our Wesleyan historians dwell with satisfaction upon the economic developments of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries rather in the spirit of John Bright than of modern social reformers. For the founder was always interested in industry and improvements. In his earlier and less experienced days he busied himself, amidst his ceaseless spiritual labours, in the pioneer toils of the Georgian settlers, and throughout his life he

[1] Cf. *New History of Methodism*, vol. ii. p. 394.

took pleasure in noting the success of his followers; only, of course, as a symptom of a settled life and in due subordination to their more serious interests. He never thought of his community as detached from the general concerns of the nation, nor were he or they wanting in the most pronounced patriotism. From the days when as a young man he shared in the foundation of the last colony established before the American Revolution down to the time when he protested with all his accumulated authority against the American revolt, he was always interested in the expansion of Empire. And for him and his followers this empire was personified by the Georges. We are apt to think that a feeling so picturesque and unselfish as loyalty was cherished only by the adherents of the Stuarts. But the Methodists were as enthusiastic for the House of Hanover as any Scottish Covenanter. In some of the records of their lives, contributed to the *Arminian Magazine* at Wesley's instance by his preachers, we find a vigorous expression of this loyalty. Thus John Haime tells us:

'I was preaching one day, when the Duke (of Cumberland), unknown, came to hear me. I that day desired the soldiers never to come there—to the preaching in the camp in Flanders—or to any place of public worship, so as to neglect any duty. I exhorted them to be ready at all calls, and to obey those who had the rule over them; and if called out to battle, to stand fast, yea, if needful, fight up to the knees in blood. I said, "You fight for a good cause, and for a good king, and in defence of your country. And this is in no way contrary to the tenderest conscience, as many of you found at the battle of Fontenoy; when both you and I did our duty, and were all the time filled with love, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost."'

Soldiers, indeed, were among Wesley's most faithful and effective assistants, and the elevating force of religion is conspicuously shewn in the simple eloquence which many of these uneducated men had at their command when they undertook to narrate their lives. By a happy inspiration a selection from Thomas Jackson's 'Lives of the Early

Methodist Preachers' has recently been published.[1] Of the thirty-seven in the original publication, which deserved to be reprinted as a whole, the editor notes that no less than a quarter are the lives of soldiers.

Thus Wesley belonged thoroughly to his age in his mode of thought, and was able to appeal to it. One appeal, of singular force in an earlier generation, he never made. The old Puritans had used to the utmost the motive of fear. John Rogers, we are told, 'used to take hold of the supporters of the pulpit canopy, and roar hideously to represent the torments of the damned.' Such was the preaching of the old Calvinists, from which the very Nonconformists, their descendants of the eighteenth century, had generally revolted. Early in his career Wesley observed how transitory was the emotion of fear excited by the prospect of shipwreck, and convinced himself that 'they will never obey from fear who are dead to the motives of love.' On this Mr. Curnock remarks that in the four volumes of his sermons, which form part of the doctrinal standard of the Methodist Church, there is none on hell, or even on heaven. But later in his life a new wave of thought swept over England and even over Europe. It has been said that the terrible earthquake of Lisbon in 1755 dispelled the easy optimism which had found its philosophical expression in Deism. In its place there came a profound fear of death. A whole charnel-house literature arose to meet the popular demand. It was not necessarily religious, though the teachers of religion seized upon it for their own purposes with the same promptness and dexterity with which our pulpit orators of to-day make the best of Darwinism and of recent psychology. But the literature was popular not because it dealt religiously with the grave, but because it dealt with it. Blair's 'Grave,' Harvey's 'Meditations among the Tombs,' Young's 'Night Thoughts,' may serve as samples of the more serious type. But, even if it were unintentionally, writers who gave to these thoughts literary expression, effective then, though for the most part insufferably tedious to us, were serving the cause of the revival of religion;

[1] *Wesley's Veterans*, edited by John Telford. London [1909].

and Wesley, though he did not originate, and certainly did not abuse this tendency of thought, was powerfully aided by its presence in the minds of his hearers.

When we turn to the manner in which Wesley employed his talents and his opportunities, we should err if we supposed that his chief interest was with masses of men. His practical life at Oxford began with ministration to individuals, in prison or elsewhere, as the opportunity presented itself. An important part of his education was also played by his Georgian experience as chaplain on an emigrant ship and among the settlers. It was the only occasion when he had the opportunity on a large scale of learning by the making of mistakes; and he used it to the full. Mr. Curnock in the published first volume of the Journal has for the first time allowed us to follow his proceedings. Never was devotion more grievously misapplied. With passionate zeal he threw himself into the task of moulding the lives of his flock. The ship's company were treated as though they were voluntary attendants at some parochial mission. Willing or unwilling, they were exhorted, examined as to their spiritual state, forced to listen to his readings and prayers. Repugnance was naturally excited. As Mr. Curnock says, interpreting the concise notes of the Diary, 'the spiritual atmosphere was charged with the possibility of dispute and confusion . . . No relief is permitted. There is no trace of recreation, or even of changed occupation, breaking the monotony of this exalted and unhuman rule of holy living.' But this was not the worst. A crowded party, largely consisting of women in enforced idleness, became a scene of bickering and scandal, and Wesley listened credulously to the gossip, and passed it on. Quarrelsome people had the gratification of telling fictions about their neighbours' characters, which they knew would be made occasions of rebuke by the chaplain to the supposed offenders, and which they knew that he would not have the reticence to keep out of his general conversation. With 'amazing credulity,' to use Mr. Curnock's words, Wesley played into the hands of the worst passengers upon his ship—people who were soon to attempt to blast his brother's

reputation by unfounded charges of immorality. Nor had he recovered his judgement when he entered upon his indiscreet relations, ending in unmerited pain to her and deserved reproach to himself, with a lady of his Georgian flock. But never has poetical justice dealt out a more exact retribution than when the wrongs of Miss Sophy Hopkey were avenged by the termagant Mrs. Vazeille, whom he married in his later days. This Georgian episode, however, is the one occasion of failure in Wesley's life. His pastoral zeal was unabated, and astonishing as are his travels and his feat of oratory, we should not be wrong in regarding his wise and persistent interest in the personal welfare of his followers as an equal evidence of his powers. In particular, his dealings with his preachers, men who, with all their devotion, were often headstrong and wilful, are a pattern of tact and insight. He had a memory for each, and an insight into the strong and the weak points of his character. Though some rebelled, and a few proved morally unworthy, it is proof of Wesley's genius that he retained the loyalty of such an army of helpers, and stimulated them to the full use of their capacities. But his personal interest was not limited to the forces he controlled ; the evidences are numerous and touching that the reason why he inspired affection among countless humble souls was that his brief words and letters of sympathy shewed his individual care for his people.

But that people could not have been gathered without his marvellous powers of appeal. It must be confessed that his sermons, like so many others of all periods, do not stir the reader of the printed page. Yet the results were astonishing and permanent, though Wesley himself was at a loss for any human explanation of his success. He knew that he could produce vehement emotion and lasting conviction, and he deliberately exercised the power and calmly contemplated the result. Strange as the physical consequences often were, he had no doubt that the whole effect was providential, and therefore worked for good. Some of his assistants had the same power, as for instance Joseph Benson. It was not the histrionic capacity of Whitefield,

who, earnest as he was, possessed and consciously developed the gift of thrilling multitudes by exertions no doubt legitimate and perfectly explicable. But this was at the cost of great nervous tension, while in Wesley's case there seems to have been no more than the natural weariness caused by frequent addresses to large numbers in the open air. It was his wise custom to shorten his services and addresses, and work in the open air he regarded as essential. It brought upon him brutal hostility, but this was of no account in comparison with the opportunities it gave him of appealing, often with success, to the most furious of his adversaries. But the success of his open-air preaching, and that of Whitefield, has a wider cause. As Mr. W. H. V. Temperley says in the 'Cambridge Modern History':

'the unconventionality of their methods aided their success among the poor . . . As the medieval scholastic thinker anticipated the modern democratic philosopher, so the eighteenth century field-preacher may claim to have foreshadowed the modern platform speech and mass meeting. The whole population of a remote village or country town, where strangers were very rare, came out to hear the far-travelled preacher, and were under the spell of excitement before he had uttered a word.'[1]

We must remember that newspapers were unknown except to the few, and that political interest, both in counties where freeholders alone voted and in boroughs where the franchise was closely limited, was hardly felt. There was no awakened intellectual interest in England till the Methodist movement, and its success was greatly due to the fact that it supplied one. We cannot suppose that it was a purely spiritual interest that sustained the readers of countless dingy pages of controversy concerning predestination. As Christology was the topic of the barbers' shops in the days of St. John Chrysostom, so the rival doctrines of Arminius and Calvin furnished the lower middle classes of the eighteenth century with a whetstone for their wits. This was, no doubt, a secondary and unpremeditated result, but it shews that the movement was

[1] *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. vi. p. 89.

not merely one of emotion, but of mental as well as spiritual discipline.

If Whitefield shares with Wesley the honour of exciting this new interest in Christianity, Wesley alone has the credit of organizing his disciples into a permanent body for mutual support. It is true that the little Oxford fellowship of the original 'Methodists' was not founded by Wesley; it had been gathered before he joined it. But the usefulness of such a society was always before his mind; and on Whitsunday, 1736, he founded at Frederica in Georgia the first of his multitude of Methodist Societies. Its religious exercises were informal services and the singing of hymns. On his return to England, while still associated with the Moravians and acting under the advice of Peter Böhler, he founded his first English Society which met on May 1, 1738, and the rules of which are printed under that day in his Journal. Its members were once a week to meet together to 'confess our faults one to another and pray for one another, that we may be healed.' They were to be divided into 'bands' of not fewer than five or more than ten persons, and it was the rule 'that every one in order speak as freely, plainly and concisely as he can, the real state of his heart, with his several temptations and deliverances, since the last time of meeting.' All the 'bands' held a combined conference once a week, begun and ended with singing and prayer; and once a month there was a day of general intercession, and on every fourth Sunday 'a general lovefeast, from seven to ten in the evening.' In the following year, 1739, came the severance from the Moravians, which brought with it no change in the working of this and the other societies which came to be founded on the same model, and with the same object of seeking Christian perfection.

In this institution, which is now decaying, we have reached the chief evidence of Wesley's genius. For more than a century the class, over which Wesley soon set a leader, was to be the stronghold of Methodism. It bound its members together in an intimacy which extended far beyond the immediate domain of religion. As in the Wesley

family, each member had a right to know all the fortunes of the others; and where so much was known it must have been very difficult for a brother either to transgress or secede. But apart from this moral support, the stimulus of a common fervour must have been powerful; and, on a lower plane, the proceedings must have had all the interest of a novel or drama. Wesley himself unfolded to his kinsfolk the progress of his adventure with Miss Hopkey, and the early Methodists seem to have been equally communicative among themselves.

We must now consider who were the members of these societies, which belonged in a full sense to the English Church and consisted of its communicants. Leaving out of our reckoning Wesley himself and his allies among the clergy, we shall find that in most cases the Methodist association was the first to which they had given any serious allegiance. The number of devout churchmen among the laity who entered it seems to have been small: Wesley himself did not regard such persons as the primary objects of his Mission, and amid all the indifference of the age they could find what they wanted amid their old surroundings. Those who did join him, even the best of them, had first become concerned about religion under his teaching. Many of them, as they tell us, had had devout parents, usually belonging to our Church, but till they heard Wesley had led careless or even vicious lives. In regard to this last confession it is well to bear in mind the tendency of consciences grown sensitive to exaggerate the sins of the past. There is no reason to suppose that the 'profligacy' or the like of which we often read should always be taken literally. For our present inquiry the point of importance is that the Methodist society was the first religious interest of such men. They had no earlier associations connected with their parish church to balance their devotion to the class, and their duty as communicants, in spite of the fervour of the Wesleys' hymns, cannot have been so prominent or so frequent a part of their spiritual life as their attendance at the weekly and monthly meetings of the society. Thus, when a breach with the Church approached, there was little to hold back such

Methodists as these, devout though they were. But there was another class among Wesley's adherents upon whom the Church had no claim at all. Many of the Nonconformist bodies were in a decadent state, and their vigorous members were attracted to the new community, either by the prospect of sharing in a more bracing religious life for themselves or of taking part in successful evangelistic effort. They were not repelled; the only condition of membership in the societies was earnestness and regularity of attendance. And so numerous were these adhesions to Methodism that they excited a keen resentment among the old Nonconformists. Wesley appeared to them not so much an evangelist as an intruder into the province of other men, just as the Salvation Army in our own day is said to have incurred the displeasure of some of the Methodist bodies by enticing away their most energetic adherents.

If the private exercises of the 'band' or the 'class' had exhausted the activities of these excellent people whose religious associations had hitherto been non-existent or even hostile to our Church, it is possible that they might in time have been quietly absorbed. There was nothing in their belief that was contrary to the Church's doctrine, and they would have learned by degrees to sympathize with the Church's characteristic tone and modes of thought. But from the first they wished to preach and were encouraged to preach. Wesley was strict in requiring evidence of character and faith, but he was curious about nothing else. He was indifferent to the ecclesiastical sympathies of his preachers because he regarded them as an altogether subordinate class. Their work was to use their gifts—he demanded evidence that they had 'gifts, as well as grace, for the work'—for the winning of souls; it was his task to provide a spiritual home and training for the converts. The itinerant preachers were to be always moving. Six or eight weeks, Wesley held, was too long a residence in one place; the preacher would preach himself out and lose his audience. Such flying visitors as these had no need of a system of divinity; though, to do Wesley justice, he impressed upon them the value of study and laid it down as a duty

that they should 'spend their mornings in this employ.' But he did not expect much from them beyond their primary task of awakening the careless; and the frankness with which he states to them their inferiority to himself is sufficient proof that he meant to allow them no part in framing the policy of Methodism. Their relation to him was that of the non-commissioned to the commissioned officer, socially as well as in matters of duty. 'Aristocrat and artisan' is the rather unhappy phrase in which one of his historians has described the position. Wesley, in fact, was no aristocrat but, like a multitude of others, a clergyman of ancient descent and modest means; but the old Methodists were as well pleased to recognize his superiority as their successors are to magnify his social rank.[1]

Subordinate as they were, the preachers became a great power. It was impossible to limit the scope of their teaching, and to prevent them winning influence over their converts. Ubiquitous as Wesley was, and active in their respective spheres as were his clerical supporters, it was inevitable that the visible Church to multitudes of his people should be the Methodist assembly, and the real ministry the itinerants and class leaders by whose teaching they profited. And Wesley himself contributed to this feeling by the very effective organization which he devised for his preachers. All who are interested in Methodism have seen and admired the 'plan,' by which for three months the services in the scattered chapels of the circuit are arranged with precision and equity. It was instituted in 1754, and ever since the succession of preachers, voluntary and professional, has been a topic of the keenest interest to Methodists. Not only do they know to whom they are to listen Sunday by Sunday, but the changes of ministers from circuit to circuit make them acquainted with a larger proportion of their clergy than is the case in other religious bodies. The annual announcement of the decision of the

[1] This is by no means a solitary example of innocent pride in contact with greatness. Sixty years ago an Irish peer who had done some public service became a Methodist. After his death a pamphlet was published entitled, 'A Coronet laid at Jesus' feet.'

Conference as to the future sphere of work of its ministers, is the most exciting event of the ecclesiastical year. The rapid advance of one to the post of superintendent of a circuit, the approaching retirement of another heralded by his acceptance of a small and easy charge, the evidence of failure in a third by his relegation to some dull and decaying circuit, or on the other hand the choice of a man of unusual power to vivify some torpid district, which has sunk from the status of a self-supporting circuit to that of a mission, subsidized from headquarters: such is the burden of Methodist conversation when the eventful publication is made. For every neighbourhood has known a long series of ministers and has taken a kindly interest in all; some it has admired, and with others it has been patient, remembering that soon their three years will have flown. All this is the work of Wesley; and it has given not the single minister, but rather the collective ministry, a deserved weight in the communion. Perhaps it would not be unjust to connect this comparative unimportance of the single preacher with Wesley's depressing influence upon his predecessors. Methodism has never been dominated by its ministers, who have been marked rather by a high average of usefulness than by special prominence of individuals. Where these have reached such prominence it has been usually by gifts of administration rather than by those specially belonging to the Christian ministry or to the pursuit of scholarship. In proportion to their number, the Wesleyan clergy have counted among them far fewer men of mark than those of some other denominations.

This numerous and influential body, as we have seen, largely consisted of men whose whole religious interest was in their own work, and who, though no doubt they received the communion loyally and profitably in the parish churches, would have been equally willing to communicate elsewhere, had discipline allowed it. They would have been still more pleased to make their own a complete Church, by taking upon themselves the administration of sacraments, as the ministers of the denominations around them were doing. In this wish they were encouraged by their flocks; and indeed

in many places the difficulty set by unsympathetic clergy in the path of Methodists desiring to communicate must have forced the notion of a communion of their own upon their minds. It was doubtless practical considerations such as this that led Wesley to reconsider his inherited view of the Christian ministry. By 1767 he was thoroughly unsettled in the matter; in 1784 he began to act upon the assumption that Lord Chancellor King's theory was historically true, and at his death there was already a considerable number of ministers ordained by him, and some by a shadowy Greek bishop named Erasmus, from whom, however, he made no attempt to obtain an episcopal succession. In all this he had the support of his adherents. Already in 1744 the Conference had discussed the matter with 'Pauline freedom and prophetic insight,' and the pressure upon him must have been almost irresistible. Yet at the last, after the founder's death, there was a natural and creditable shrinking from a formal separation. As late as 1792 resort was had to the lot, whether or no the general administration of the Sacraments should be undertaken. The lot fell against it; but in 1795 it was left open to the societies to choose for themselves, and they chose to separate. This leaving of freedom to the individual societies is one of the few acts savouring of weakness that the Conference has committed. Indeed, when Wesley founded it, and especially after laymen (that is, men who were neither clergy nor itinerants) were admitted in 1777 to its ranks, it was inevitable that it should share the character of all such corporate bodies, and strive to extend its field of action. From 1795, then, the Wesleyan preachers performed every function of the Christian ministry; but not in obedience to the theory which had satisfied Wesley. It seems that the Wesleyan minister is regarded as a layman to whom a distinct, though still a lay, duty is assigned, and that the usefulness of the ministry is accepted as the justification of its existence. The title 'Reverend' was adopted in 1818; the laying on of hands, carefully guarded by the express assertion that it is not essential, in 1836.

We must say a word about the other type of Methodist preacher, the unpaid local volunteer. He appears to have fallen on evil times. A few years ago, no figure was more familiar, or more respected, in country districts, than the humble labourer, instructed only in his Bible, who would put his bread and cheese in his pocket and trudge in all weathers on a week-day evening and through long Sundays from one little chapel to another to deliver his message. Such men are now almost extinct, not because they could not be discovered if sought, but because the congregation will not listen to them. Whether they have been adequately replaced only Methodists know. By an innovation which Wesley would not have approved, they are now being trained in special establishments for the humbler task of what is known among ourselves as the paid lay-reader, without hope of rising to the minister's rank. And generally it seems the local preacher, even of a more educated type, is tending to disappear, and the professional minister to take his place.

We have now considered one chief cause of separation, the rise of a body of preachers bred with no sympathy for our Church, and naturally desirous of exercising a complete ministry. Against such a desire Wesley had taken no precautions, and therefore he must bear the responsibility for the severance. For there was nothing in the relation of the Church to this movement to make it inevitable. There was hostility in many quarters, fierce and discreditable, but there was in others a warm attachment, and Wesley was not the man to be deterred by opposition from a course which he had deliberately adopted. If he had taken due precautions he could have secured a permanent union ; he did not take them, and much as we are ashamed of Bishop Lavington and his fellows, we cannot regard them as the cause of the separation. If we are to seek a second cause we must do so in the mutual repugnance of Arminians and Calvinists. As it happened, the mass of the latter party stayed in the Church ; if the Arminians with Wesley at their head, had done so, in all probability there would have been a great Calvinist secession. Modern

rhetoric minimizes the difference, and Calvinism based upon texts of Scripture is so foreign to our thought that we can barely conceive how reasonable men can have held it. But they did hold it, fiercely and tenaciously, and therefore there could be no home for their opponents in the Church which sheltered the Calvinists, and soon came to take its tone from them. There was a recrudescence of the same old bitterness between Lutheran and Calvinist which checked the spread of the Continental Reformation. In those days of keen dogmatic interest each party regarded its opposite as equally mischievous with the Papists; when the Evangelical revival awakened a fresh interest in dogma, as grave an antagonism was excited.

We must not think that Wesley or his followers favoured innovation. We have seen their enthusiasm on the battle-field for the House of Hanover; it was only in this sense that they shewed any sympathy with the cause of the Whigs. Wesley himself was intensely conservative; like another of the wisest men of his age, he wrote and spoke against the American Revolution, and his followers took the same side. Like the American churchmen, they were loyalists, and some of them suffered for their loyalty; we read of them imprisoned, flogged, tarred and feathered. It is difficult to explain why the Episcopal Church in the United States has never recovered from the unpopularity caused by its English sympathies, while those of the Methodists were quickly forgotten, and their society has enormously increased. In the dangerous days of the French Revolution it was natural that the Methodists should be on the side of established institutions. The dominant intellectual force on the side of change was that of the Unitarians, who represented all that was most repugnant to the Methodist mind, devoted as it was to the glory of our Lord. And Whiggery, even aristocratic Whiggery, was deeply under Unitarian influence; to mention most exceptional instances, one Whig bishop was known to subscribe to the building of a Socinian Chapel, and another to use his influence with the 'Moderate' theological faculty of Edinburgh to gain the degree of Doctor of Divinity for a

Unitarian minister. Besides this, as the natural reward of sober and industrious lives, the Methodists of this time had acquired much property; and with it the instinct of order. If, as Wesleyans boast, Methodism saved England from a French Revolution, it was not merely that they had undoubtedly leavened a multitude of English people with Christian principle. They were an organized regiment in the army of Pitt, and did him effective service, though the social and political conditions of England differed so widely from those of France that his fears and theirs were groundless. Before the first Reform Bill the Wesleyans were supplying Tory members to Parliament, among them that Michael Sadler who was the butt of some of Macaulay's most ingenious vituperation. Sadler was of that type of Methodism which adhered simultaneously to the English and Wesleyan Church. It survived in England till the middle of the nineteenth century, in Ireland till the date of disestablishment. And in later times there has always been a strong conservative element, not in a merely political sense, among Wesleyans. It is, perhaps, diminishing, and prominent ministers nowadays often use the characteristic language of a Miall and a Binney; whether on their tongues it has quite the same meaning as with those more accustomed to use it, we cannot say; nor do we know how far the barrier, often complained of by the Nonconformists, which the Wesleyans have erected between themselves and other dissidents from our Church, is being broken down. It may be a symptom of approximation to the others that the use of our liturgy is reported to be diminishing in Wesleyan congregations.

Hitherto we have spoken of the main body. But the Methodists separated from it are almost as numerous. In the last winter a 'representative gathering of the Methodists of Great Britain and Ireland of all sections' has for the first time been held in Wesley's historical chapel in the City Road, London. The delegates were sent in proportion to the numbers of their respective societies, the total number being 500; the Wesleyans were 276, the Primitive Methodists 112, the United Methodists 100, the

Reform Union 6, the Independent Methodists 6. The present minor bodies represent the coalescence of a number of separations, which arose mostly from quarrels on constitutional points—chiefly as to the share in government of the ministers and the laity. These disputes were often embittered by personal rivalries and violence of speech, and sometimes were due to an exercise of power which might be called tyrannical on the part of the dominant oligarchy in the Wesleyan community during the early part of the nineteenth century. Jabez Bunting, a man of great governing capacity, thoroughly in earnest, and always sure that he was in the right, exerted for many years a control over the Conference which lost to Wesleyanism a great proportion of its members, many of whom abandoned Methodism altogether. In the long-run his system broke down, and with it the tendency to schism. The tendency now is to reunion, and a long step has been taken in the creation in 1907 of the United Methodist Church, which combines what were three separate denominations. The Primitive Methodists stand apart from the rest. They represent an emotionalism which lingered into the nineteenth century in the Potteries and cotton districts when it had died out in other Methodist quarters. The American device of camp-meetings, with waves of hysteria and accompanying moral dangers, was introduced by local preachers to fan the flame of revival, and on Mow Cop, a hill on the borders of Cheshire and Staffordshire, results were manifested in 1807 equal in their wildness to those of the early meetings of Whitefield. The staid rulers of the Wesleyans took the alarm, and attempted to suppress the movement. But it had in Hugh Bourne a leader who was one of the most remarkable men produced by Methodism. A mechanic of that hard northern type which either accumulates a fortune or drinks itself to death, unless, like the Sir Roger Scatcherd of Anthony Trollope, it does both, he was limited in culture and mental power save in one direction. He was a mystic, of a type which is genuinely, even if only faintly, reminiscent of St. Theresa of Spain. His mystical inspiration was the source of boundless faith and

endurance and rendered him not only an evangelist of power, but an organizer of skill. The Primitive Methodists are mainly his work, and represent Methodism in its simplest, and it may be said, its crudest form. The Wesleyans would probably find it more difficult to amalgamate with them than with the United Methodists, though here again there might be difficulties due to such causes as the varying level of culture in the different bodies of ministers. Of the minor societies the Reform Union are practically Congregationalists and the Independent Methodists have a discipline borrowed from the Society of Friends. All are vigorous in spite of difficulties, and all are doing a mission work among the heathen which is very great in proportion to their numbers.

We have not spoken of Wales, where Methodism, since the early days, has had no special success. The Calvinistic Methodists, in fact, are neither Calvinistic nor Methodist, but a Presbyterian body. Nor have we space to say much of the great Methodist bodies in the United States, of which a very full, and often a very American, account is given in the second volume of the *New History of Methodism.* It is to that country that Methodism owes its multitude of members, estimated by themselves at 30,000,000, though the cautious editor of 'Whitaker's Almanack' will allow them only some 18,000,000 of adherents. The Methodists there are not united; the greatest and oldest body among them, that which gives the title of Bishop to its superintendents, has formed, since the great war, two communions, Northern and Southern, which do not seem to be on altogether amicable terms. We hear of encroachments by each upon the domain of the other. But we do not hear, save in terms of indistinct reference and of indiscriminate laudation, about those wild scenes of excitement at camp meetings with which English readers are most familiar in the 'Biglow Papers.' Nor is there any attempt at psychological analysis, nor any dispassionate statement of facts. Perhaps it is natural that the fervid South should exceed in this respect; and Bishop E. E. Hoss, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, wields an eloquence

and commands a wealth of laudatory synonyms, which will doubtless inspire enthusiasm in the majority of his readers. But those few whose ears are not deafened, and whose judgement is not swept off its feet by the torrent of his words, will be tempted to an excess of doubt.

The same must be said of several of the English chapters in the 'New History.' The writers protest too much. Everything, in spite of appearances to the contrary and of contradictory admissions by other writers in the same volumes, is gladness and success and superlatives. We are inevitably reminded of the grave words of Mr. Charles Booth in his *Religious Influences in London*, which refer in his pages to the Wesleyans, but are evidently applicable to Methodists at large: 'the enthusiasm and over-wrought emotions of the Wesleyans produce a false atmosphere of exaggerated language . . . in self-deception the Wesleyans have no equals, and this it is that seems to me to undermine the value of much of their work, whether among their own people or among the poor.' We are not convinced when we read that all is for the best in these best of all religious denominations, that Methodism is the final perfection of Christian doctrine and discipline. And our doubts are further excited when we find that the frame has been blackened to make the picture stand out more bright. In their self-confidence the Methodists are ready to set the world to rights. They are the representative Evangelicals of our country, that school of thought being depressed and in danger of extinction, in our Church. The Roman Church, naturally enough, is the object of vigorous reproach and vigorous proselytism; but it is to the credit of American Methodism that the utmost candour is shewn in revealing the faults of the methods, the agents, and the converts in their Italian mission.[1] Foreign Protestants and English-speaking Congregationalists are also used to point the moral of Methodist superiority.

On the other hand there is evidence enough of weakness and decay, common to Methodism with other religious bodies.

[1] *New History*, vol. ii. p. 402.

No one can walk the streets of Northern towns without noting the chapels, colossal cubes of brick fronted in the fashion of an Attic temple with ponderous columns of blackened stone, which were reared sixty or seventy years ago even by the minor Methodist schisms. It is obvious that those bodies filled then a larger place in the public eye than now; in fact, for large classes of English people the alternative seems to have lain between Methodism and indifference. There was no third choice, in the Church or elsewhere. Now, though the neighbourhoods are as crowded as ever, the chapels are empty. Sunday Schools are a disappointment, we are told, and the 'class' system is breaking down. Among the main body of Methodists, whose keen constitutional instinct led in our grandfathers' day to many conflicts and divisions, interest in the administration of their Church is dormant. Though the use of the Book of Common Prayer is decreasing, extempore prayer is proving a failure. Such are a few of the complaints we read; and our fellow-feeling is awakened. But our sympathy is chilled by conventional and unfounded complaints that should be left to the professional politician. We find the cuckoo cry of village tyranny repeated by one who ought to know better. In truth the one insistent tyranny is that of the village shop, to which in England as in Ireland too many of our country folk are permanently in debt; and the proprietor is less likely to be a churchman than either the farmer or the labourer.

But, after all, Methodism broadly surveyed does not excite our pity but our admiration. Its difficulties are our own, and its successes are an encouragement and a pattern to ourselves. When we consider the great Central Missions which Mr. Hugh Price Hughes instituted, we are tempted to wish that in the poor quarters of our towns we were not hampered by the parochial system. If Bishop Blomfield had not planted his twelve Apostles in Bethnal Green we might have had some great collegiate Church, an inspiration to the workers at the Oxford House. Those workers have worthy rivals at Bermondsey and Finsbury, where the Wesleyan settlements are powerful for good. If their

notions concerning elementary education and the training of teachers are undenominational, their supply of secondary schools is ample and admirable, and we must hope that their system of theological education may soon be crowned by a joint College at Oxford. It will be the more welcome if they plant it not among trim suburban grassplots, but in the ancient and humble quarter where the Franciscans dwelt. But above all we must think of the great company of Methodist people, impressive not only for their numbers, but for their singular unanimity of thought and feeling. They are, not so much by their works as by their existence, among the most impressive evidences of Christianity.

Much of this article has been taken up by a review, direct and indirect, of the *New History of Methodism*, a quarry of accurate information and first-hand views of the utmost value. We have used it as yet chiefly as a source; we must now express our thanks to the thoughtful and statesmanlike men who have given in it a general survey of the *raison d'être* and prospects of Methodism. Of these Dr. Workman reminds us pleasantly of our own Dr. Figgis. He has the same wide range of analogy and the same ingenuity in employing it; he is equally modern in his psychology and his philosophy of life. Perhaps it is all too much in the taste of the moment to have the assurance of permanent value; but at least he has made a thoroughly interesting contribution to thought, and no one can peruse him without a fuller sense of the scope of Christian truth and a higher value for the Methodist presentation of that truth. Dr. Workman is somewhat unequally yoked with several of his partners in the book; we fear that he cannot feel quite proud of them, and that they will be a little suspicious of him. Nor will they be comfortable in the society of Mr. Scott Lidgett and Sir Percy Bunting, whose frank recognition of the changes in the proportion of doctrine and of the possible advantage of merging Methodism in Presbyterianism must jar upon the contented loyalty to the ideal of the eighteenth century which we find among most of our instructors. We have much to learn from thinkers of the

calibre of those we have mentioned; *mutatis mutandis* their problems are ours. And the hope and faith they cherish in regard to their great and beneficent church must kindle in us the increase of a kindred feeling.

E. W. WATSON.

ART. II.—THE EUCHARIST IN HISTORY.

1. *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist.* By DARWELL STONE, M.A., Pusey Librarian, formerly Principal of Dorchester Missionary College. In Two Volumes. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1909.)
2. *The Body of Christ. An Enquiry into the Institution and Doctrine of Holy Communion.* By CHARLES GORE, D.D., D.C.L., Bishop of Birmingham. Fourth Edition. (London: John Murray. 1907.)
3. *The Quest of the Historical Jesus, a Critical Study of its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede.* By ALBERT SCHWEITZER, Privatdozent in New Testament Studies in the University of Strassburg. Translated by W. MONTGOMERY, B.A., D.D., with a preface by F. C. BURKITT, M.A., D.D., Norrisian Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. (London: A. and C. Black. 1910.)
4. *Das Abendmahl in den zwei ersten Jahrhunderten nach Christus.* Von AXEL ANDERSEN, Gymnasiallehrer a. D. in Christiania. Zweite Ausgabe. (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, vormals J. Ricker'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1906.)
5. *Das Abendmahl im Urchristentum. Eine exegetische und historisch-kritische Untersuchung.* Von JOHANNES HOFFMANN. (Berlin: Georg Reimer. 1903.)
6. *Das Letze Passamahl Christi und der Tag seines Todes.* Von D. CHWOLSON, Professor Emeritus. Anastatischer Neudruck der Ausgabe von 1892 nebst drei Beilagen. (Leipzig: H. Haessel. 1908.)

7. *Das Abendmahl in Zusammenhang mit dem Leben Jesu und der Geschichte des Urchristentums.* Von Lic. Dr. Albert Schweitzer. (Tübingen und Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr. 1901.)
8. *Zur Geschichte der Abendmahlsfeier in der ältesten Kirche.* Von Adolf Jülicher. 'Theologische Abhandlungen Carl von Weizsäcker zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstage, 11 December 1892, gewidmet.' (Freiburg i. B.: J. C. B. Mohr. 1892.)
9. *Die Kelchbewegung in Deutschland und die Reform der Abendmahlsfeier.* Von Friedrich Spitta. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeek & Ruprecht. 1904.)
10. *Die heutige Abendmahlsfrage in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung.* Von Karl Gerold Goetz, Pfarrer, D. theol., Privatdozent in Basel. Zweite Ausgabe. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. 1907.)
11. *Les Origines de l'Eucharistie.* Par Jean Réville, Professeur au Collège de France. (Paris: Leroux. 1908.)
12. *Eucharistie und Agape im Urchristentum.* Von P. Dr. Ephrem Baumgartner, Ord. Min. Cap. Lekter der heiligen Theologie. (Solothurn: Buch- und Kunstdruckerei Union. 1909.)

And other Works.

The *History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist* by Dr. Darwell Stone[1] is a very remarkable work. This we say, not merely on account of the learning and care which it exhibits, but because of the spirit in which it is written. It is unfortunately the case that just that Christian rite which, more than any other, ought to be a sacrament of unity, has been the cause of some of the bitterest controversies, the most uncharitable utterances, the cruelest persecutions which have marred the history of Christianity. Dr. Stone does not approach the subject from at all an indifferent point of view. He has a firm and strong belief of his own, a belief which represents, probably in a somewhat rigid form, the Tractarian tradition of the Church

[1] Dr. Stone's book is based on a series of articles by him which appeared in volumes lii–lvii of the *Church Quarterly Review*.

of England. He holds this tenaciously, but he has shewn that it is possible to do so and record the views of others without any note of adverse criticism or a single breach of the law of Christian charity.

Dr. Stone's object is to give a history of opinion concerning the Eucharist. His aim has been in every case, so far as is possible, to allow the different writers with whom he deals to speak for themselves. He gives very full and ample quotations from representative theologians of every party and point of view. His own comments are reduced to the smallest possible dimensions —in fact, sometimes we might ask for a little more; and the object of the method that he has employed, and his purpose in writing, is to make for peace. In the concluding chapter he sums up his aim thus:

> 'The aim of this book is historical. It has been the purpose of the writer to tabulate and classify facts. He has tried to record opinion, and, so far as has been possible, to abstain from passing judgments on it. To him it has seemed that the collection of evidence has in itself been a work which is worth some little pains.' [1]

He asks to be allowed, in conclusion, 'to express his mind on three practical topics. The first is

> the width of the appeal made by the rite of the Eucharist. In times so different as the first century and the tenth and the twentieth, at every intervening moment of Christian life, the Eucharist is seen to be acknowledged as the chief privilege of the Christian religion. . . . It is touching to notice the language of devotion which men of most divergent beliefs have used in reference to the rite as to the explanation of which they have widely disagreed. This unanimity tells its own tale as to the needs of human thought and life.'[2]

The second point is his

> hope that disagreement in regard to the doctrine of the Eucharist may decrease. Something may be anticipated as a result of that

[1] *A History of the Doctrine of the Eucharist*, vol. ii. p. 648.
[2] *Op. cit.* vol. ii. pp. 648–9.

calmer way of viewing religious problems which is increasingly found. The scientific study of history with all that it manifests in regard to the past and its exhibition of the real mind of the best representatives of different points of view may do much. Old crudities of thought as to the nature of presence and the conception of reality are less influential than they were. It is being recognised that the relation of matter to spirit and of spirit to matter is a more complex problem than once was thought. The essential feature in sacrifice is being seen to lie deeper than death or destruction, as it is understood that the dedication of abiding life is no less sacrificial than the death which in some circumstances is a necessary part of the oblation of the will.' [1]

The third point on which he would lay stress is the

'great need of a generous temper and an ungrudging way of viewing the opinions and expressions which are least congenial. . . . To insist on fixing a carnal and unspiritual view of divine and supernatural things on the utterances and acts of those who protest in their theology that their doctrines are spiritual and uncarnal is even more unjust than it would be to charge a theologian like Bishop Pearson with carnal teaching because he may have thought that the identical material particles of our present bodily life will be re-assembled in the body of the resurrection, and that our Lord in His ascension passed through local divisions of material space to a circumscribed heaven. Whole series of volumes of controversial theology leave the student wondering over the want of insight and imagination and candour and justice which led to their being penned. And, if it is true that champions of Protestant controversy have utterly failed to understand that which they have attacked, it is also true that there have been misunderstandings and consequent misrepresentations on another side. The rejection of a particular method of the presence of Christ has too often been understood as if it were the rejection of the presence of Christ altogether. The separation of His special presence from the elements has too often been thought to mean the assertion of His absence from the rite. The repudiation of particular notions of sacrifice has often been regarded as the denial of sacrifice in any true sense.' [2]

[1] *Op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 649.

[2] *Op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 650.

So far as we can judge Dr. Stone has carried out his purpose admirably. He is conspicuous both for his charity and his fairness. It may be that we do not in every case agree with him. It is equally true that there are some limitations to his work which we shall have to notice later. But the particular point that he has aimed at he seems to us to have achieved, so far as one can consider it possible. It is sad that we should have to say it, but to have written a book on opinions concerning the Eucharist in so Christian and fair a spirit is remarkable, and we can only earnestly pray that the spirit of this work may have a far-reaching influence.

We will give two or three instances of Dr. Stone's method of treatment; and first we will take the Berengarian controversy. There is no point upon which it is customary for people to express their opinion more strongly than on the condemnation of Berengarius. Dr. Gore, for example, feels that he must guard himself by using the very strongest language from any suspicions of sympathy with such mediaeval doctrine.[1] But this is not Dr. Stone's method. He tries here, as elsewhere, to make the best of things.

'It is noteworthy that the most carnal phraseology of the statement made at the Council of Rome of 1059 is absent not only in the shorter definitions of the Councils of Rouen of 1063 and Rome of 1078, but also in the longer statement of the Council of Rome of 1079. Moreover, while there is no doubt that carnal tendencies existed both in language and in thought, the probability must not be forgotten that such phrases as "the real body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are held and broken by the hands of the priests and are crushed by the teeth of the faithful" were used by many as clumsy ways of expressing the conviction that the Sacrament which is so held and broken and crushed is the body and blood of Christ.'[2]

And later on he reminds us that Innocent III[3] had

[1] Gore, *Body of Christ*, p. 116: 'Thus transubstantiation in its first form, as for example the weak and unhappy Berengar was forced by the dominant power in the church to subscribe to it, was indeed a gross and horrible doctrine.'

[2] *History of the Eucharist*, vol. i. p. 258. [3] *Op. cit.* vol. i. p. 310.

adopted this interpretation. Now this may be ultra-charitable, but we believe that it is very much for the advantage of the Church that the best view should be taken even of that which we are inclined to condemn.

The next instance that we would select is the commentary upon the views of St. Thomas Aquinas. The summary concludes thus:

'Different minds will estimate differently the soundness of the arguments and conclusions of St. Thomas in accordance with differences of natural temperament and experience and philosophic opinions; it might well be agreed by all scholars that with the methods of his age and with the light that was possible to him, he strove earnestly to preserve belief in the spiritual character of the Eucharistic presence of the body of Christ. The significance of this fact will be seen when it is remembered that his was the most powerful theological influence in the West in the Middle Ages.'[1]

The third instance we will take is that of a very different theologian, Zwingli. Here we have a writer whose teaching has probably been exposed to more uncharitable attacks even than that of the opponents of Berengarius. But Dr. Stone is as free from condemnation in the one case as he was in the other, and he is equally careful to represent all sides of the teaching that he is dealing with.

'He interpreted our Lord's words at the institution of the Sacrament as figurative only, and regarded the consecrated elements as merely symbols of the body and blood of Christ. As a rule he speaks of the Sacraments as signs only; but there are some passages in his writings which appear to imply or affirm a spiritual feeding of the soul on Christ in connexion with the reception of the Sacrament.'[2]

And again:

'In the *Reply to Emser* it is allowed that "the Eucharist is spiritual food, whereby those who believe that the death of Christ is their life fasten and join and unite themselves mutually into the one body of Christ."'[3]

[1] *Op. cit.* vol. i. p. 334.
[2] *Op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 38.
[3] *Op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 39.

And again he gives us the following remarkable quotation :

' "A flower is more noble when it is put in the wreath of a bride than if it be used in some more common way, though as to its matter it is the same as the other flowers. One who takes from a king his signet ring is reckoned guilty of a far worse crime than if he had taken only so much gold, though the matter is no different at all. In like manner the matter of the bread is no different from all other ordinary bread, but the use of it and the dignity of the Supper give it an excellence far above that of ordinary bread." ' [1]

We believe that anyone who reads carefully the few pages upon Zwingli will come away with the conclusion that, however inadequate he may feel that the teaching of Zwingli was, yet to Zwingli himself the Holy Communion was a very real spiritual act ; that he believed in his own way that through it spiritual life came to him, and that it was possible even for him that it should be the centre of his religious devotion.

We have no doubt at all that Dr. Stone's intention is throughout his work to make us feel how very much greater the points of union with regard to the Holy Eucharist are than the points of divergence. Often it has been on a comparatively small point that the great controversies on these things have arisen : they have been concerned with words and theories which are now obsolete ; they have been concerned with attempts at accurate definitions ; they have only indirectly touched on fundamental religious truths. As we have read through page after page of quotations from different authors, the thought which Dr. Stone wishes to impress upon us has become more and more clear, and we have felt the real truth there is in it. For all alike the Eucharist has been the centre of their religious life. All alike have connected it with the spiritual union between Christ and His Church. All alike have seen in it the commemoration in some form or in some way of the sacrifice on Calvary. None have really believed that it was a repetition of that sacrifice. When the controversies are over, when

[1] *Op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 41.

the storm has ceased, we realize what a very little difference there is in level between the top and the bottom of the wave. We deplore the virulence of the champions, but we believe that it lies only on the surface, and that the real spiritual life of devout believers in Christ has been as little changed as the surface of the sea is really changed by a storm which has passed away.

One general criticism we would make. It is a great misfortune that we have translations only and not also the originals of the extracts. No doubt there was a very obvious reason for this in the expense, but we cannot help wishing that it had been found possible to produce the work in a way which would have conferred an inestimable boon on scholars. So far as we can judge, Dr. Stone's translations are generally scholarly and accurate, but he must occasionally make mistakes. This is really our main criticism on the book. There are others which have been made, which are more or less justified, and which will appear in the subsequent course of the article. What we propose to do is in the first place to examine some of the criticisms which have been offered on Dr. Stone. Our reason is that, when a writer with his learning puts forward a book clearly intended to be in the nature of an Eirenicon, it is desirable to see how far it is so accepted. We then propose to examine the account of the institution of the Eucharist, for we think it would be generally admitted that in the Biblical portion of the work Dr. Stone's treatment is the least satisfactory; and we shall then in conclusion put forward certain lessons which we believe can be drawn from the history of the subject, and which we hope may help on Dr. Stone's aim at promoting Christian unity.

I.

We may pass shortly over certain criticisms on Dr. Stone's work which are really based on a misconception of his point of view. Attention is drawn to the fact that he does not attempt as a rule to investigate the causes of the

changes in opinion; that he writes, if we may express it so, a history of doctrine in the old sense of the word rather than a *Dogmengeschichte* of the type of that of Harnack. This is true, but it must be noticed that Dr. Stone's aim is not to record why people thought in a particular way, but what they thought. It is true that he looks upon this subject from the point of view which inspired the works of the Tractarians. But that, it must be remembered, is the point of view from which a very large proportion of believing Christians still regard it. What is the teaching of the Church—not studied genetically, but studied dogmatically? This is for a large portion of the Christian world the ultimate basis of truth, and this it is with which Dr. Stone is concerned. We could wish, perhaps, that he had paid more attention to modern historical inquiries as to the origin of the Eucharist. We might wish that he had given some account of modern German theology. It would, we believe, have helped him in his purpose. But we cannot complain that he does not do what he has not undertaken to do. These criticisms on his work have brought home to us how great the chasm is between certain modern schools of historical investigators and the old-fashioned school of doctrinal theologians. The former are very much absorbed within the narrow limits of their inquiry, and have almost a contempt for the older methods of study. There are faults perhaps on both sides, but truth cannot be gained in that way. If we are to arrive at harmony and true belief on the Eucharist it will be necessary for the subject to be approached from both points of view. The great mass of the religious minds of the world still base their beliefs, and will continue to base their beliefs, on traditional theological teaching, and no ultimate agreement can be arrived at unless the two separate methods of investigation are brought into closer sympathy with one another.

We must unfortunately now pass to a certain number of criticisms which seem to us lamentably unfair. A conspicuous example is contained in a short notice in the *Expository Times*. The author writes as follows:

'Now Mr. Stone has written this book, consisting of two large volumes, in such a way as to show that his own account of the teaching of the New Testament on the Holy Eucharist has been and is the doctrine of the holy Catholic Church from the beginning even until now. We do not hint that Mr. Stone has chosen his quotations or twisted them in order to prove his own propositions. But he does not for a moment hide his leanings. And it would certainly have been a great perplexity to him if he had found that the historical doctrine of the Church differed from his interpretations of the doctrine of the New Testament. And the field is large. The opportunity for choosing this and rejecting that quotation occurs at every turn of the page. Another author might have found a different doctrine in the New Testament. And if he had, he would certainly have been able to show that representative Church theologians agreed with him.'

We have seldom read a more unjust or unscrupulous passage than this. It is suggested that there are important aspects of the subject in the field of Church history which Dr. Stone has left out. We must challenge the writer to tell us what they are. It is represented again that the object of the writer of the book is to obtain support for his own views. There is, so far as we can see, not a shadow of ground for this accusation. There is a conspicuous determination to be fair throughout the work, and it would be quite possible to select hundreds of quotations which Dr. Stone gives that would be quite inconsistent with the view which he is believed to hold. It is clear that he has studied the history of the subject with the determination to see carefully what exactly each writer says.

There is a similarly unfair criticism in a review in the *Record* :

'The period of the Great Councils,' the writer says, 'is summed up by an effort to show that the frequently used words "figure" and "symbol" do not mean what they express, but imply that the symbols in question are that which they symbolise. Mr. Stone finds this effort necessary because of the frequent use of such language.'

No doubt the writer of this passage thought that he was

criticizing Dr. Stone rather cleverly, but we believe that he has done nothing but shew his own incapacity to grasp the historical point of view. If he will take the trouble to read the quotations which are given and also the opinions of Professor Harnack on the meanings of the words 'figure' and 'symbol,' he will perhaps gradually realize that it is not necessary that a word should mean exactly the same thing in the third or fourth or fifth century that it does at the present time. We shall return to the theories on the relation of the spiritual and material held by the Fathers. But we feel bound to defend Dr. Stone from an attack like this, which is intended to create a prejudice against him, and which gives the impression that the writer does not understand what he is talking about.

Perhaps the unfairest review of all is that which was contained in the *Times*. We will take two or three instances of this unfairness and treat them at length, because they really deal with points in themselves of great importance. The first is with regard to the doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice in the ante-Nicene period :

'Summing up, for example, the results of his investigation into the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice in the ante-Nicene period, he [Dr. Stone] says :—

"The belief that the Eucharist is a sacrifice is found everywhere. This belief is coupled with strong repudiations of carnal sacrifices ; and is saved from being Judaic by the recognition of the elements as Christ's body and blood, of the union of the action of the Church on earth with that of Christ in heaven, and of the spiritual character of that whole priestly life and service and action of the community as the body of Christ, which is a distinguishing mark of the Christian system."

'In other words, by keeping his terms sufficiently broad, Mr. Stone succeeds in convincing himself that the doctrine which he teaches to-day of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is identical with the doctrine of St. Ignatius, St. Justin Martyr, and St. Irenaeus, who, it is to be presumed, agree among themselves.'

If our readers will turn to the chapter in question they will see how singularly unfair this criticism is. Dr. Stone tells us quite clearly the different views of each succeeding

writer. He never says that they all teach the same; he never says that they agree with himself; he tries to bring out their various interpretations.

The next point is the reviewer's criticism upon Dr. Stone's interpretation of the word ποιεῖν in 1 Cor. xi. 24–29. Dr. Stone translates it 'sacrifice,' according to a method of interpretation which has been followed by a certain number of writers. As we shall shew presently, we do not agree with him; but it must be recognized that there are strong arguments in favour of Dr. Stone's point of view, and that at any rate the comment of the *Times*' reviewer: 'A mind capable of drawing such a conclusion from such premisses is impervious to what is ordinarily meant by argument,' is conspicuously unfair.

The meaning of the expression has been investigated recently by a writer of the name of Andersen, who is apparently a teacher in Sweden, and who approaches the subject—certainly not from the point of view of Dr. Stone—with very considerable knowledge of modern investigation. He begins with an examination of Justin's writings, and points out that, as is generally recognized, ποιεῖν is there used in connexion with the Eucharist in the sense of 'offer.' The fact that this is so proves that that meaning was one which was clearly consistent with the language of the time. He then further asks how it was that this meaning arose, and works back to the passage in St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians. He shews that the well-known passage in that Epistle was the cause of Justin's interpretation, and that there too the only meaning of the word which is in accordance with grammar is 'to offer.' The passage, it will be remembered, reads as follows: 'And when he had given thanks he brake it, and said, This is my body which is for you; this do in remembrance of me. In like manner also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood; this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.' Now, if we take the words exactly as they are given and interpret them naturally according to the Greek language, he maintains that the interpretation 'offer' is necessary. The word 'this' in

this do' can only refer back to the previous sentence, This is my body . . . this cup is the new covenant'; and if the reference is to the body and to the cup the translation 'do' is unmeaning. The only possible translation is 'offer'; for it must be remembered that in St. Paul and in St. Luke, where the expression 'This do in remembrance of me' occurs, the words 'Take, eat,' to which they apply, for example, in our Communion service, are omitted.[1]

There is no doubt that if we take the passage as we have it, Andersen's argument is of great weight, and we might, therefore, quite legitimately follow Dr. Stone in an interpretation which seemed natural to the patristic writer who lived nearest to the time of St. Paul. But it has been pointed out on the other side that it is very remarkable that this was not the ordinary interpretation of the Fathers, and it is probable that it was not really St. Paul's meaning either. How then do we account for the difficulty of interpretation? The answer is, we think, suggested in an article by Sir William Ramsay in the March number of the *Expository Times*. St. Paul, like most early writers, inserts only what is necessary for his argument. He therefore omits the words, 'Take, eat,' which were already an ordinary part of the formula in use at the time. If we insert these words, the ordinary translation becomes quite natural. The mistake, therefore, so far as it is a mistake, arose from the fact that St. Paul, dealing with a well-known formula, only quotes as much as is necessary for his purpose, and therefore makes possible the interpretation of Justin.

[1] *Das Abendmahl in den zwei ersten Jahrhunderten nach Christus*, von Axel Andersen, pp. 13–19.

'"Opfert dieses Brot," hat also nach Justin Jesus gesagt, "Dieses Brot ist mein Leib." . . . Auch Irenäus hat das Herrenmahl als eine Opfermahlzeit betrachtet, und auch er hat aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach den Opferbefehl in einem doppelten ποιεῖτε gesehen. . . . Diese Auffassung der ältesten Zeit fällt nun fürs erste zusammen mit dem, was Paulus in c. 10 von dem Herrnmahle äussert. Dann ist die Übersetzung "Opfert dieses Brot" in der Tat die einzige, die zu dem vorliegenden Texte passt und einen wirklichen Sinn gibt. Das "Solches tut!" lässt sich hören, wenn λαβών, ἀναβλέψας, κλάσας, ἔδωκεν, λάβετε φάγετε usw., der Liturgien vorangehen.'

This explanation of Sir William Ramsay's is of great importance, for it suggests that the fuller formula was behind St. Paul, and it will preserve us from the very erroneous notion that in order to find out the exact words used by our Lord at the Last Supper we must eliminate everything which is not contained in every account.[1] But we think what we have quoted will convince our readers that

[1] The first part of Sir W. Ramsay's paper will be found in the *Expository Times* for March, and it is continued, but not concluded, in that for April. We do not know in the least what conclusions he may arrive at, but the paper will repay careful perusal. Perhaps the most important point which is brought out is that behind all accounts was the knowledge of the actual rite performed in the Church :

'That the ceremony was repeated from the earliest times in the assemblies of the faithful is almost universally admitted : the theory that it was instituted by Paul has been stated, only to be rejected. This ritual repetition was familiar to all writers, and inevitably exercised much influence on their narratives. . . . It cannot be assumed that exactly the same words were used in every celebration of the rite from the beginning onward. Some slight variation is always possible in the oral transmission of a ceremony in which there was a considerable amount of speaking ; but there was at least one cause which militated against the admission of any change, namely, the fixed belief among the ancients that the efficacy of religious formulæ depended on the literal correctness with which the words were repeated. . . . None of the written accounts agrees exactly and entirely with any other in respect of the words uttered. This was not due to deficient respect for the rite or to any idea that the exact words were immaterial. It was due to the fact that none of the writers who are mentioned above aspired to become the norm or law of the ceremony.'

'There is a strong tendency to abbreviate. Even the longest account is, indubitably, far shorter than the actual incident. . . . It is therefore supremely unmethodical to argue that because certain words or details are omitted in any Source, therefore the original authority from whom that Source was derived was ignorant of them. . . . In short, bearing in mind that the ceremony was familiar to all readers as the chief mystery of the Church ritual, we see that some understood the command, "Take, eat," as the first of an eternal series of repetitions, while others understood the Institution, "This do in remembrance of me," as implying the command to repeat the whole ceremony with the Invitation (which is tacitly assumed as indispensable).'

Dr. Stone's powers of exegesis are not so contemptible as the reviewer in the *Times* suggests.

The third point on which the reviewer seems to us most unjust is in his dealings with Hooker.

'It is impossible,' he says, 'to give many examples in a short review of Mr. Stone's extraordinary gift for misinterpretation. But take one more from his account of Hooker. He will not admit that Hooker intended to avow a receptionist doctrine.'

If we turn to Dr. Stone's summary of Hooker's views, we find that he sums them up as follows:

'The present writer cannot agree either with those who have claimed Hooker as himself accepting a doctrine which connects the presence of the body of Christ with the consecrated elements previous to reception or with those who consider that he definitely intended to avow a receptionist doctrine. The sentence, "The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not therefore to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament," when viewed in its whole context, is plainly seen to demand an emphasis on the words "sought for," and to mean that the point to be considered is not as to the presence in the Sacrament but as to the presence in the communicant. On the other hand, the sentence, "This bread hath in it more than the substance which our eyes behold," is precluded by the rest of the passage in which it stands from implying a presence previous to Communion. Hooker's object was to concentrate attention on the fact of the reception of Christ by the faithful communicant on which he thought all might agree, and to avoid controversy about the further question as to the relation of the presence of Christ to the external elements.'[1]

We have quoted Dr. Stone in full because we consider that the passage is quite sufficient to condemn the strictures passed upon him by the *Times*' reviewer, and we venture to think that it is an admirable instance of Dr. Stone's desire not to interpret a writer unfairly. There are, we believe, two elements in Hooker. In order to carry out his purpose consistently, his aim was to concentrate attention on the fact that the Body and Blood were received, without either

[1] *History of the Eucharist*, vol. ii. p. 244.

affirming or denying anything beyond, and so he tells us quite definitely. 'What these elements are in themselves, it skilleth not, it is enough that to me which take them they are the body and blood of Christ.' In order to be quite consistent it would be right for him not to condemn others who believe more than he says, but the exigencies of current controversy lead him to condemn in some places both transubstantiation and consubstantiation, the only two alternative views before him. There are, then, we believe, two strains in Hooker, as there are in many writers, and Dr. Stone is more than justified in avoiding dogmatic acceptance of either the point of view which harmonizes with his own belief or the point of view which he probably may consider insufficient.

We have dealt with these three instances, which are the only instances given for the conclusion that 'Mr. Darwell Stone is not to be trusted as an historian of doctrine,' very fully, for we believe that the judgement is entirely unjust, and that it is the writer in the *Times* who has failed himself to interpret either Dr. Stone or his authorities properly.

We need not dwell any longer on this somewhat unattractive but, we believe, necessary part of our investigation. We have done so because the above criticisms and some few others which we have passed over have shewn how difficult it is to convince a certain type of writer in this country of either the *bona fides* or the fairness of those from whom he differs. We have noticed, not only in this but in other cases, a recrudescence of a narrow and somewhat ill-informed Protestant dogmatism which refuses to meet those who would approach it, and which brings general accusations of unfairness against those from whom it differs. Dr. Stone throughout his 'History' has aimed at, and generally succeeded in, being scrupulously fair. He narrates the opinions of Roman Catholic theologians from whom he differs, and of Protestant theologians from whom he differs, always fairly and always without exaggeration and over-statement; and it is this absence of exaggeration and over-statement which is, on the one side, to a thoughtful

erson a very pleasant feature of his work, and on the ther side so unattractive to narrower theologians.

II.

We must now pass to the second part of our investiation, the interpretation of the New Testament teaching. his is the portion of Dr. Stone's work which has been riticized most, and it is, we agree, unfortunate that he did ot approach the subject with fuller reference to modern peculation. His interpretation is that of Church history, s he has read it, and we are sorry that he has not also xamined carefully modern German writings on this subject, ecause we are convinced that ultimately they will be shewn o prove the justice of the interpretation of the Christian hurch, although in a somewhat different way from what Dr. Stone does.

Our aim is to try to interpret the words of our Lord n accordance with the ideas, not of either the twelfth or he sixteenth or the nineteenth century, but of the time when they were written.

There are two preliminary points which must be cleared up. The first is, What represents the original account of the rite? What were the words historically used by our Lord? To anyone who has read much on this subject there is the inevitable difficulty that so many modern writers obviously make their conceptions of the original account correspond with the deductions they wish to draw from it. There are differences, as is well known, between the different accounts. We purpose, therefore, so far as possible to make our interpretation independent of these particular differences. Certain words have probably been introduced as a gloss. It is probable that the addition of the words 'new' and 'for remission of sins' are interpretative; in both cases, we believe, correctly interpretative. But there can be no doubt, we think, that in some form or other our Lord used the words, 'This is my body,' and, in some form or other, 'This cup is my blood of the testament,' or 'This cup is the testament in my blood.' And owing

to the fact that from the beginning the rite was repeated, we cannot doubt that in some form or other He gave command for its repetition.

The second great difficulty is the relation to the Passover. It is well known that the Synoptic Gospels represent the Last Supper as a Paschal meal. It is equally certain that the Fourth Gospel—and with this probably St. Paul agrees—represents our Lord as dying on the Cross at the time when the Passover was being sacrificed, and, therefore, the Last Supper as not a Passover. To discuss the subject would, as our readers know, far transcend the limits of an article. We must therefore leave it an open question. The essential point is that in either case the death of Christ and its commemoration were definitely connected by the Church with the Passover, that the Last Supper was celebrated at the time of the Passover, when men's minds were filled with it and with its associations. This must have been particularly the case as regards the disciples of our Lord, for the disciples had clearly come up with the expectation that at that Passover was to be the inauguration of the Kingdom. And whatever may be our point of view we cannot doubt that our Lord must have acted and spoken as He did with clear remembrance of the Passover, and all that it implied.[1]

Our fundamental point then is that these words were used by our Lord in a meal with His disciples when their

[1] Sir William Ramsay, who thinks that St. John was right and St. Mark wrong, writes thus: 'For some unknown reason, the idea had taken possession of his [St. Mark's] mind, that the Supper was the Passover, although (as has been pointed out by others) some of the things which he elsewhere records are inconsistent with this idea. What was the cause of this misapprehension? It must be associated with an idea that the Passover was in some way connected with the Eucharist, so that the latter Christianized the former. To John, the slaying of the Passover was translated into Christianized form as the slaying of Christ; and the two events coincided in time. To Mark the slaying of the Passover was the preparation for the Last Supper, because the ceremony of the Bread and the Cup was an anticipation and prophecy and interpretation of the Death.'

minds were full of the Passover, and that the words would necessarily therefore be interpreted in connexion with that rite; that from the beginning the Christian Church looked upon the death of Christ and this commemoration of His death in connexion with the Passover, and therefore interpreted it in accordance with the ideas which would be prevalent at the time.

Now what did the Passover mean to an Israelite? It is always difficult to interpret the meaning of a rite at any particular period. Religious rites which begin in one period of the world's history are often retained, owing to the natural conservatism of the human mind in relation to religion, long after the primitive ideas under which they arose, and find new meanings amid altered circumstances. No doubt the history of the Passover had undergone various changes in the course of centuries, and we must be careful to avoid an unwise antiquarianism. We venture to think that the following ideas would sum up what the Passover meant for a Jew who took part in it.

In the first place, it was the great rite of the unity of Israel. When a Jew, then as now, ate the Passover, he felt he was performing the essential rite which emphasized the fact that he was a member of the true Israel. Then, secondly, it was a commemoration of all that had been done by God on behalf of Israel. It was, of course, particularly connected with the redemption from Egypt, and always at the rite the words of Exodus were read. But as it was a memorial of that act of redemption, so it would be a memorial of all the great acts of redemption by which God had saved His people. Thirdly, as the people of Israel were believed to be connected with God by a divine covenant, so the Passover would, as a rite, be a continual reminder or renewal of that covenant between God and His people. Then, fourthly, the Passover was a sacrifice, and the Paschal feast was a sacrificial meal with all that that implied.

Now we know from St. Paul what we know from the history of the subject, that the fundamental idea of sacrifice to the Jews as to the heathen was that of communion with God. We shall bring out this point at greater

length later, and therefore we will content ourselves with calling attention to the fact at present. Our Lord, then, if we believe Him to have been what He is to us, when He celebrated the Last Supper, must have known, and intended the meaning of it to be in accordance with, the ideas of people at the time. It is quite possible that He added much explanation which has not been preserved. That we do not know. But at any rate His words must be interpreted in accordance with the ideas in people's minds, and it is quite clear that the typical view of liberal Christianity, that it was merely a last meal with His disciples, is quite an inadequate explanation.

Arising, then, out of these ideas, the meaning of the Eucharist will be as follows :—

First of all, it would be for the new community which was already in existence, and which we believe it was our Lord's plan to found, the great rite of union, and its symbol. This is a thought which is predominant both in St. Paul's writings and in the two earliest commentaries that we have. The symbol of the lamb as cooked whole was renewed in the symbol of the one loaf divided amongst all the participants.

Then secondly, it was a commemoration of a great act of redemption. If our Lord, in any form—as we cannot doubt—spoke of His Body being given and His Blood being poured forth for those who were present, and for others, the only meaning could be that His death was to be looked upon as a sacrifice, and that this sacrifice would be commemorated whenever the rite was repeated, just as the old redemption of Israel had in like manner been commemorated whenever the Passover was repeated.

But thirdly, He quite clearly must have referred in some sense to a covenant. The Passover had been connected with the old covenant between God and Israel, and therefore, rightly, this covenant was represented as something new. The words used are reminiscent of the foundation of the covenant contained in the Book of Exodus. As that had been inaugurated by a sacrifice and by the pouring forth of blood, so here, at the making of the new covenant, blood is poured forth, the sign of a new relation between God and man.

Then, fourthly, this new rite would be from the beginning to those who took part in it a sacrifice. Just as the Passover was a sacrifice, so this would be one, and, being a sacrifice, it would be interpreted not in the mediaeval manner, but as people at that time thought of sacrifice. To us, it must be remembered, the death of the victim has somehow become the essential element in the sacrifice. There is no doubt that in primitive times the death was one of the least important elements. The death was an accident, necessary for the freeing of the blood; the death was necessary as preliminary to the sacrificial feast. Our Lord would die upon the Cross, His Blood would be poured forth for mankind, and therefore no longer was any offering for sacrifice in that sense necessary. This new spiritual sacrifice, as we are constantly reminded that it is, would have associated with it all the ideas that had been connected by the Jews with sacrifice. It would be a real act of communion between God and His people, and between those who took part in it. It would be a real partaking of spiritual food, a real sharing in the divine life. There would be nothing in the statement, 'This is my body . . . this is my blood,' which would cause any difficulty to the disciples when they thought over them in connexion with the institution of the sacrament.

That this interpretation is the correct one may, we believe, be shewn from two sources—from St. Paul and from the teaching of the early Church. St. Paul believed that the Christian received spiritual nourishment as the Jews had received it of old; he saw a definite parallel between the Christian communion and the sacrificial meal of the heathen or the Jew; he believed that to the Christian there is a real partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ; he believed that there is a real memorial of the death of Christ; he believed that the sacrament is a sign of Christian unity. And equally is it shewn by the Christian Church. In the Christian Church from the beginning two things are clear: the one, that the phrase, 'the Body and Blood of Christ,' was taken in a real meaning; the other that the Eucharist was from the beginning called a sacrifice. What interpretation was given to the term 'sacrifice' there may be doubt, for sacrifice had

many meanings. It was always used definitely in a spiritual sense. It was always used in contrast to the material sacrifices of the heathen and Jews which had come to an end. There was always a belief in the uniqueness of the offering of Christ.

III.

We must now for a brief space examine certain critical views. It would be impossible for us to consider all the various theories which have been put forward, and we may take as typical and as representative the work on the Last Supper by Johannes Hoffmann. It is dedicated to Professor Pfleiderer, and, as will be seen, represents a very advanced critical standpoint. The author begins by criticizing the view that the act of Jesus was a sacrament, and that leads him to explain what in his opinion was the meaning and idea of a sacrament in the ancient world. The following extract will, we think, be sufficient to illustrate his point of view :

'The fundamental idea of the ancient sacrificial meal, not only of the Jewish sacrificial meal, is that of a communion with the Deity. Through the partaking of the sacrificial flesh man receives in himself first of all the holy life of the sacrificial animal but also the life of the god himself; he enters, in a mystical but real manner, into a *living fellowship* (Lebensgemeinschaft) with God—an idea which we find also in the ancient heathen mysteries. This fellowship can be made clear in the simplest manner by the popular idea of Possession. In this the deity enters into certain men and takes entire possession; the cases of possession in the New Testament form the clearest example of this. In somewhat the same way in the sacrificial meal the god enters into men, just as, according to John, the devil enters into Judas as soon as he eats the first morsel. There is, on the other hand, also a communion between the partakers established by the sacrificial meal, since all receive the same sacred life of the sacrificial animal and enter into the same living fellowship with the Deity.

'Since the sacramental operation of the sacrificial meal, which to ancient ideas is natural and easily understood, remains

strange and incomprehensible to modern notions, we must beware of ascribing to the ancients those reflexions which we ourselves tend to attach to the sacrament. Because, according to our present-day ideas, it is simply irrational and improbable that a fellowship between man and God should be established by the performance of an external operation such as the repast in the sacrificial meal, we easily tend to see the relation between the external operation and the religious effect of the sacrament, not as that of cause (Mittel) and effect but as that of symbol (Bild) and thing symbolized. The external performance of the sacrament appears to us as a symbolical thing, so that it illustrates pictorially the *effect* (Wirkung) of the sacrament. Perhaps the thought is also present of how the Mediating Theology (die Vermittlungstheologie) and the cultured laity can make Baptism and the Lord's Supper clear to themselves. Because for them these traditional ecclesiastical performances have the value of Sacraments, but, at the same time, the outward performance cannot, according to their ideas, be the means of the religious effect in which they believe, they conceive the outward performance both in Baptism and the Lord's Supper as a symbolical act which illustrates what the Christian experiences by faith. The sprinkling with the water of Baptism is thus commonly a picture for the fact that the man is purified from his sins, the partaking of food in the Lord's Supper is a picture for the appropriation of Christ. This view of the Church Sacraments, widespread at the present time, is a clear sign that we neither possess nor understand the sacramental idea: our sacraments are, in fact, entirely different in kind from those of antiquity. Hence, too, our Reformer was not any better acquainted with the real sacramental belief of the ancient world when he maintained that in Baptism it is not the water which mediates the religious effect but the word of God which accompanies it (das damit verbunden ist).

'On the contrary, for the men of antiquity the external performance is never a merely symbolical thing, but always the means, and it was within the sacraments alone that the fellowship with the Deity ensued; the sacred, consecrated food of the sacrificial meal or the religious meal in general is therefore the material (sinnenfällige) means, the vehicle.' [1]

This exposition is accompanied by a careful examination

[1] Hoffmann, *Das Abendmahl im Urchristentum*, pp. 15–17.

of St. Paul's language, and Hoffmann has no doubt at all that this represents St. Paul's meaning. St. Paul looked upon the Eucharist as a real sacrament; he believed that there was a real communion in the Body and Blood of Christ, that this came from the vehicle of the bread and wine that were used, and that the spirit was definitely inherent in the matter.

Hoffmann then goes on to argue that this could not have been the point of view of our Lord, and the reason he gives is the following:

'Thus the Lord was to His disciples during his whole life nothing else than a man, that is, a prophet mighty in deed and word. From the standpoint of the later community a heightening of the Person of Jesus was first possible and conceivable. From this dogmatic standpoint our sources have been composed and it is this that, in so far as they are unhistorical, they must be understood to indicate. If they represent a sacrament, Jesus is not to them the man of history but a divine Being. Apart from that, the sacramental Lord's Supper supposes the dogma of the propitiatory death of Christ as already common and firmly established. But to the historical Jesus this was unknown, as we shall hereafter shew. On these two things the view of all those who consider that the Lord's Supper was established as a sacrament is wrecked, and our present texts can also speak to the same purpose.'[1]

Now those of our readers who followed the article on 'The Christ of History' which we published in the last number of this Review will see that we are in exactly the same situation as was dealt with in that survey of modern criticism. Hoffmann, we need not say, is of opinion that the supernatural conception of the Person of Christ (and therefore any supernatural idea of what our Lord did) was due to St. Paul and to the influence of St. Paul. We shewed then that that interpretation was really impossible; that what St. Paul thought about the Messiah the disciples must have thought about the Messiah; that they had quite clearly accepted Him as such; that the Gospels represented Him, and represented Him not in isolated passages but in

[1] Hoffmann, *Das Abendmahl im Urchristentum*, pp. 31, 32.

their exposition as a whole, as claiming the Messiahship and everything that it implied; that it was because He claimed the Messiahship that He was put to death, and because He was believed to be the Messiah that the early Christians preached Him. The reason why so many do not accept this is that it is inconsistent with modern notions of what is probable. It is clear that if we may take Hoffmann as an interpreter of the ideas of the first century the position is exactly similar. The language which our Lord is represented as using—which in our opinion He undoubtedly did use—is only consistent with the idea that He was founding a sacrament. That sacrament means substantially what the general tradition of the Christian Church has considered a sacrament to mean. The only difficulty in accepting this view is the doubts that are held as to the real divine nature of our Lord. We thus see that the question of the sacrament and the question of the divinity of Christ are inextricably entwined. If Christ were not divine, *cadit quaestio*—He did not found a sacrament; He did not teach His disciples that they would gain spiritual food by eating and drinking His Body and Blood; He did not speak of His death as in any sense sacrificial; He lived and died as a human prophet and nothing but a prophet. But if He was what the Church has always believed Him to be, the natural and historical interpretation of the words used at the Last Supper implies a rite for the Christian Church of a sacramental character; and even if there may have been formalism or exaggeration or an excessive development of philosophical language in the interpretation of that rite at various times, yet the tradition of the Christian Church has been true. The two then support one another, and our narrative as we have it is consistent and harmonious. The historical theory of Christ harmonizes with the historical theory of the sacrament. The picture of an ordinary meal in the upper room which was altered and changed by the Christian Church is inconsistent with the language of the New Testament. It represents the ideas of the nineteenth century and not the ideas of the first.

We may conclude this part of our subject with two

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC

quotations from the work of Dr. Schweitzer to which we referred in our last number, and which has since been translated:

'On this interpretation, therefore, we may think of Baptism and the Lord's Supper as from the first eschatological sacraments in the eschatological movement which later detached itself from Judaism under the name of Christianity. That explains why we find them both in Paul and in the earliest theology as sacramental acts, not as symbolic ceremonies, and find them dominating the whole Christian doctrine. Apart from the assumption of the eschatological sacraments, we can only make the history of dogma begin with a "fall" from the earlier purer theology into the sacramental magical, without being able to adduce a single syllable in support of the idea that after the death of Jesus Baptism and the Lord's Supper existed even for an hour as symbolical actions—Paul, indeed, makes this supposition wholly impossible.'[1]

'Thus the thoroughgoing eschatological interpretation of the Life of Jesus puts into the hands of those who are reconstructing the history of dogma in the earliest times an explanation of the conception of the sacraments, of which they had been able hitherto only to note the presence as an x of which the origin was undiscoverable, and for which they possessed no equation by which it could be evaluated. If Christianity as the religion of historically revealed mysteries was able to lay hold upon Hellenism and overcome it, the reason of this was that it was already in its purely eschatological beginnings a religion of sacraments, . . . since Jesus had recognised a Divine institution in the baptism of John, and had Himself performed a sacramental action in the distribution of food at the Lake of Gennesareth and at the Last Supper.'[2]

IV.

We pass on to the Eucharist in the Christian Church. As we have seen, it represented, even in its original foundation, exactly the ideas and thoughts which harmonized with those of the ancient world. It was a part of Christianity which

[1] Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, p. 378.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 379.

appealed, and appealed definitely, to the popular mind, and therefore it became quite naturally, as it was intended to do, the central rite of the Christian Church, enshrining in a visible form the great ideas of Christianity. It is sometimes said that the first age of the Church interpreted the Eucharist in terms of the Mysteries. That is only a very imperfect way of looking at it. No doubt the Mysteries influenced Christian thought and practice to a certain extent, but not in any fundamental way. The Christian Church interpreted the sacrament in harmony with the general religious and metaphysical ideas of the time. We do not propose to dwell at length on this period, but it is important, we think, to examine one writer as an illustration of the tone of thought at the time, for it will suggest the point of view from which we approach the whole subject.

The teaching of St. Cyril of Jerusalem is particularly important, since in him we have a definite popular exposition of what an average churchman—and that we must consider St. Cyril to have been—put forward as the teaching of the Christian Church on the subject. He teaches the greatest reverence for the Holy Eucharist.

'Make thy left hand a throne for thy right, as for that which is to receive a king. And hollowing thy palm receive the body of Christ, saying over it the Amen.' [1]

He sometimes uses language which might be held to imply a physical change in the elements.

'The seeming (*φαινόμενος*) bread is not bread, even though it is sensible to the taste, but the body of Christ, and the seeming (*φαινόμενος*) wine is not wine, even though the taste will have it so, but the blood of Christ.'

'Trust not the judgment to thy bodily palate; no, but to unfaltering faith; for they who taste are bidden to taste not bread and wine but the antitype (*ἀντιτύπου*) of the body and blood of Christ.' [2]

[1] Darwell Stone, *History of the Eucharist*, vol. i. p. 106. The extracts which follow are from the *Catechetical Lectures*, xxiii. 21; xxii. 19; xxiii. 20; xxii. 4, 5; xix. 7; xiii. 19; xxii. 3; xxiii. 20; xix. 7; xxi. 3; iii. 3.

[2] *History of the Eucharist*, vol. i. p. 103.

On the other hand, the gift is definitely described as of a spiritual character.

'Christ, in discussion with the Jews, said, "Except ye eat My flesh and drink My blood, ye have not life in yourselves." They not having understood His words spiritually were offended and went back, supposing that He was urging them to eat flesh. . . . In the new covenant there is heavenly bread and a cup of salvation, sanctifying soul and body. For as the bread corresponds to the body, so also the Word is appropriate to the soul.' [1]

The consecration is looked upon as a definite act which produced a change, and is connected with the invocation of the Holy Ghost.

'The bread and the wine of the Eucharist were simple (λιτός) bread and wine before the invocation of the holy and adorable Trinity; but when the invocation has taken place the bread becomes the body of Christ and the wine the blood of Christ.' [2]

He uses also the word 'figure' in this relation:

'"According to the Gospel His body bore the figure (τύπον ἔφερεν) of bread"; "In the figure (τύπῳ) of bread is given to thee the body, and in the figure (τύπῳ) of wine is given to thee the blood"; "the antitype (ἀντιτύπου) of the body and blood of Christ."' [3]

In the above passages we have instances from one writer of the very varied language used in the Church of the fourth century. We now come to one passage of greater importance than the others, because it will enable us to reach St. Cyril's point of view, and through him that of the early Church generally.

'The things which are hung up at the idol festivals, whether flesh or bread or other such things, having been defiled by the invocation of the foul demons, are reckoned in the pomp of the devil. For as the bread and the wine of the Eucharist before the invocation of the holy and adorable Trinity were simple (λιτός) bread and wine, but when the invocation has taken place the bread becomes the body of Christ and the wine

[1] Darwell Stone, *History of the Eucharist*, vol. i. p. 91.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 71. [3] *Ibid.* p. 64.

the blood of Christ, so in like manner such food of the pomp of Satan, though in its own nature simple (λιτά), becomes profane (βέβηλα) by the invocation of the demons.'

'Beware of supposing this chrism (μύρον) to be bare (ψίλον). For as the bread of the Eucharist after the invocation of the Holy Ghost is no longer simple (λιτός) bread but the body of Christ, so also after invocation this holy chrism is no longer bare (ψίλον), nor, so to say, common but becomes Christ's gift of grace (χάρισμα), and by the coming of the Holy Ghost fit to impart His Godhead.'

'Do not pay heed to the laver as simple (λιτῷ) water, but to the spiritual grace that is given with the water. For as the things that are brought to the heathen altars, though simple (λιτά) in their nature, become defiled by the invocation of the idols, so contrariwise the simple (λιτόν) water on receiving the invocation of the Holy Ghost and of Christ and of the Father acquires the power of holiness.' [1]

In commenting upon this passage we do not think that Dr. Stone reaches quite the point.

'It is obvious,' he writes, 'that in themselves the parallel between the different rites and the whole conception of the heightened efficacy of the Eucharistic elements are capable of two interpretations. In themselves they might mean that in all cases alike the outward part is merely the instrument employed to effect a particular purpose, or that, while in all cases the outward part is the instrumental means whereby a spiritual purpose is effected, in the case of the Eucharist it is more than an instrument and itself contains or is identified with that which it is the means of bestowing.' [2]

Dr. Stone here sums up the two points of view—which for convenience we may call the High Church and Low Church opinions—from which this passage and others like it are interpreted. Both are, we believe, wrong; for both read nineteenth-century views into the language of the early Church. What we have to remember is that in the fourth century the hard division between material and spiritual, which is so prevalent at the present time, was not

[1] Darwell Stone, *History of the Eucharist*, vol. i. pp. 67–8.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 69.

then made. The spiritual was not isolated from the material; it was seen everywhere in the material. We can bring out the contrast most clearly by quoting a short passage from Zwingli:

'Nor do we think that those are to be heard who say, We indeed eat the real and bodily flesh of Christ, but after a spiritual manner. For they fail to see that to be a body and to be eaten after a spiritual manner are inconsistent with one another; for body and spirit are so different that, whichever you take, the other cannot be.' [1]

This represents the exact antithesis to the point of view of the early Church. It was then felt that spirit was in body, and because later ages have made the hard distinction that Zwingli does we have had all the difficulties of the Eucharistic controversy. On the one side current opinion has refused to see the possibility of anything sacramental—of anything beyond a mere symbol. It considers that if you speak of a symbol you mean that there is not the reality. On the other hand theologians, to escape that point of view, have invented elaborate theories such as that of transubstantiation, to explain what seemed difficult. The early Church saw, quite naturally and simply and without any difficulty, the spiritual in the material. They had never developed a philosophy which banished God from the universe, and made Him so completely transcendental as many modern theories have done. They saw everywhere in the universe the work of God and the possibility of His presence; therefore they felt His presence, in accordance with His promise, easily and naturally in the Eucharist. And thought is coming round to a theory more like that of the early Christian ages. There is indeed a great difference as well as a resemblance. It is more scientific, or rather, it is wholly scientific. It sees God everywhere, not as the antithesis of law, but as the embodiment of law. But it sees God in the universe. Nor does it separate spirit from matter: it looks upon matter rather as a manifestation of spirit. Music, preaching, art, all teach

[1] Darwell Stone, *History of the Eucharist*, vol. ii. pp. 39, 40.

us spiritual truths through material media. Sound is as much material as sight, and therefore we cannot make the distinction which is sometimes made between the ministry of the word as spiritual and the ministry of sacraments as material. Both are spiritual and both are material.

Dr. Stone is so complete in everything that he gives that he enables us to criticize him merely from his own quotations, and provides a medium for criticizing many other persons. We cannot but think that, if he had been just a little more in sympathy with the point of view of the fourth century, he would have been able to build up the theology in which he believes on a stronger basis.

V.

We come now to the final questions: What is the orthodox teaching about the Eucharist? What does the Church bid us do and teach? What is true?

As regards the teaching of the Church of England it is, we think, clear, from the many extracts that Dr. Stone gives, that our formularies have been drawn up and our theologians have taught in a way which gives us very wide liberty of thought. Zwinglianism is condemned; but we have our doubts whether a believing Christian was ever really a Zwinglian. Transubstantiation is condemned. But within these limits any theory of the Eucharist is compatible with authorized teaching. That is made quite clear by the long extracts from the charge of Archbishop Temple, who probably sums up the mind of the Church in its broadest aspect. It is clear that the receptionist doctrine is loyal to the Church of England. It is clear that a belief in the real presence is loyal to the Church of England—a belief in the real presence stated in any form which avoids the technicalities of the scholastic philosophy and of transubstantiation. In this broad point of view we believe the Church of England to be entirely right, but we would go further; we would remind our readers that though there was intense belief there was no necessary formula about the Eucharist until the twelfth century;

and we would express an earnest hope that it may be recognized that that is the right point of view. There should be no necessary teaching imposed by authority about the Eucharist, either positive or negative. We should condemn neither Zwinglianism nor transubstantiation.

We would deduce this point of view from the command of Jesus and the meaning of the rite. What our Lord said was not 'This believe in remembrance of me,' but 'This do in remembrance of me.' The sacrament, therefore, of the Eucharist, like the sacrament of Baptism, is a rite in which something is commanded to be done. What the Church therefore has to do is rightly to fulfil the commands of its Master, and to celebrate the Eucharist as He celebrated the Last Supper in all essential features. And that is what it has done through the long period of its history. The essential elements, either in Baptism or the Eucharist, are the fulfilment of the command of Jesus and the use of the words which He Himself used. If we do that, then the rite itself will always teach people as it taught them in the days of the early Church.

In support of this point of view we should like to emphasize certain points.

Turn to the Church of England. In the Church of England at the present time there are very great varieties of view, or apparent varieties of view, as regards Eucharistic teaching; but all alike can use, and can use with absolute sincerity and with the same religious devotion, the Communion Service of the English Church. A remarkable conference was held at Fulham, in the year 1900, to discuss Eucharistic doctrine, and from the views put forward on that occasion extracts are given by Dr. Stone. At that conference it became clear that it would be with great difficulty that its members would be willing to subscribe to a common formula. The number of points which they were capable of discussing was very great. But when we turn from doctrine to devotion we shall find that there is little to choose between the language of Bishop Moule and the language of Lord Halifax as to the devotional side of the Eucharist. Both are convinced and believing Christians;

both feel the reality of the worship, the reality of the spiritual gifts, the reality of the presence, although, owing to the accidental circumstances of their education, the language in which they have expressed their belief is different.

Further, we believe, that on these lines, and on these lines only, will it be possible for any reunion of Christians to take place. At the present time there are supposed to be considerable differences between the Church of England, the Church of Rome, and the Eastern Church. Yet we believe that there is nothing, in the language of either the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom or the Roman Mass, so far as regards their Eucharistic teaching, which a sincere member of the Church of England could not use and use with spiritual edification. It is well known that Bishop Field, in the seventeenth century, held that 'the Canon of the Mass, used in the mediaeval Church, did not involve any doctrine contrary to that held since the Reformation,' and at the Fulham conference a very interesting statement to the same effect was read from the Rev. A. W. Hutton, who had left the priesthood of the Church of Rome and no longer believed the normal Roman teaching, but held that he 'could still say Mass according to the Roman rite with spiritual profit and devotion.'

We should therefore wish heartily to concur with the Bishop of Birmingham's statement in the Preface to his last edition of *The Body of Christ.* In criticizing the recent Commission on Ritual he deplores, as we must deplore, the attempt to condemn certain usages and practices which have recently been introduced into the Church of England, on the ground that they were inconsistent with the belief of the English Church. Like him, we hold that that is not the right way of looking at them. The belief which is held by those who introduced these usages is, we believe, entirely loyal to the Church of England. The ground, and the only ground, on which we can condemn them, and would condemn them, is that they are inconsistent with the purpose of our Lord laid down when He instituted the Christian Eucharist. He gave us the spiritual gift of His Body and Blood in the medium of bread and wine, that we may

by their means feed on Him spiritually. Our Article, therefore, is correct when it condemns certain practices because they are inconsistent with the action of our Lord in founding the Eucharist.

'The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same they have a wholesome effect or operation: but they that receive them unworthily purchase to themselves damnation, as Saint Paul saith.'

We believe, then, that the duty of the Church is to guard the Sacraments carefully by ordaining that they be celebrated in the right way and that they be not used for purposes other than those for which they were founded, and we believe that if this is done we can confidently allow great freedom of teaching. The Eucharist appeals to different persons in different ways. No positive teaching, therefore, should be discouraged. To one it means a commemoration of the death of Christ; to another it appeals most as spiritual food; to another it appeals because in it Christ is in a special way present to us. No one who believes in Christ can doubt that He used the words He used in an entirely real sense, and therefore, into whatever category of thought we bring them, with whatever scientific or metaphysical presuppositions we approach them, we shall, if we are believing Christians, always believe them. As teachers we should study the Eucharist in relation to the thoughts of our Lord as He instituted it, and the more we study it the more it will mean. We shall realize it as reproducing for us all that was implied in the Jewish Passover. It is the great sacrament of Christian unity. It is a sign of the special relations of Christ to His Church. It is in it that we are united with Him and with all those who devoutly partake, those with us and those far from us. In our Easter Communion we shall feel that we are doing what the Church throughout the world is doing, and that we are united with it in the bonds of brotherly love and affection. We shall know that that is for us the Christian sacrifice, and

therefore we can ascribe to it everything which is implied in the word 'sacrifice' which is not inconsistent with the belief that Christ Himself is the one sacrifice once offered for the sins of the whole world. It is the sacrifice of ourselves, our souls and bodies. It is a great sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. It is the sacrifice of the Church which is His body. It is the pleading before the throne of God of the one sacrifice once offered. The spiritual meaning of the Christian Eucharist is inexhaustible. We are the heirs of the religious devotion of all the great ages of the Church. In the freedom of the Church of England there has been an immense revival of spiritual teaching concerning it; no Eucharistic doctrine is probably richer than that of the English Church; and it will be in the freedom of the universal Church that the full meaning of the Christian Eucharist will be realized.

ARTHUR C. HEADLAM.

ART. III.—CHRISTIANITY, SCIENCE, AND 'CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.'

1. *The Truth and Error of Christian Science.* By M. CARTA STURGE. (London: John Murray. 1908.)
2. *Religion and Medicine.* By SAMUEL MCCOMB, M.A. (Oxon.), D.D. (Glasgow), ELWOOD WORCESTER, D.D., Ph.D., and ISADOR H. CORIAT, M.D. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co., Ltd. 1908.)

And many other Works.

'Whatever this is that I am, it is a little flesh and breath, and the ruling part.'—M. AURELIUS ANTONINUS.

EVER since man, himself a creature, took his place among created things, it has been his self-imposed task to question the mystery of his being, and that of his environment. With every faculty possessed he has probed the mystery, and in response to his questionings there have come from out the darkness certain manifestations which he is content to accept as part revelations adapted to the limitations of his finite being—manifestations in which he is content to rest.

Among these treasured gleanings here is one to which all existing theologies give assent: 'In the beginning God

created.' Underlying this premiss is the conception of the nature of God which has arisen in man, the conception, namely, of a self-sufficing, all-powerful, beneficent Being: of this Being the premiss states that all things, man included, took origin, as a creative act. When the beginning was does not concern us, but only that at a point or points in time, man and things, the whole cosmos, began. It does not signify how, whether simultaneously or in sequence, creation obtained, it matters only that it was of God: this creation we call Nature. Advancing from this primal premiss man has never ceased to search within and without for further revelations, and the more he has sought, the more has been revealed, and the more he has wondered at the beauty, the completeness of the fabric of which he is a part. His gatherings he has called Science, and where he has seemed to discover a comprehensive plan or ruling he has named it a Law; so constant, so faithful have been these rulings, each time he has made appeal to them, that he has come to look upon them as infallible: these Laws he has inscribed durably as a code, the code of Nature. The whole scheme of creation has been mapped out and apportioned by questioning mankind—unto these the Heavens, unto these the earth, its dry land, its waters, the living things of the land and sea and air: thus the sciences have come to be.

But as man has continued to peer and pry and pursue, with equal steps Nature has retreated, denying, yet inviting, and always promising. Nothing loth, the bold investigator has pressed on from highway to byway, from byway to footpath, and now the footpath has disappeared, and Nature with her secret has slipped into the undergrowth, and man has lost himself. He had started so well—'in the beginning God'—and now in the half-light and the tangle of the thicket he sees only things created: Nature has put up a screen between him and the Divinity—the handiwork has hidden the fashioning hand.

The story goes far back: first it was corporeal substance, in its infinitude of form, which captivated and dominated; at this stage Body (*σῶμα*) became the graven

image of worship. But upon examination the graven image was found to be in flux; as the worshipper gazed the features altered: they softened, they ran as water, they thinned, they dispersed as a mist:

'The hills are shadows, and they flow
From form to form, and nothing stands;
They melt like mist, the solid lands,
Like clouds they shape themselves and go.'

Face to face with this flux, this inconstancy of things, it was not possible to find rest in the inertia of a grosser materialism. Newton had not yet framed his law of inertia, but it could not escape the reflective mind of the ancients that change of state implied a cause in operation, and accordingly the doctrine of Spirit (*πνεῦμα*) arose. This declared the presence of a subtile, all-pervading essence —'tension,' which, penetrating as a thin breath or fine flame into every part of the corporeal mass, conferred upon substance the particular qualities belonging to things, whereby these became dynamic. In the most literal sense of the word the 'pneuma' transfigured the 'soma,' for under its influence the corporeal became plastic as wax in the hand of the modeller. We have no difficulty in recognizing here the modern doctrine of force, and we see also in the primary conceptions of the nature of the 'pneuma' the same belief in its eternal existence, its indestructibility, as that to which modern science has set its seal. But in the inconstancy of things what more inconstant than humanity itself! If in the volcano, if in the earthquake, the tempest, the corporeal is convulsed, under the impulsion of the 'pneuma,' what of the body of man in his moods as the gusts of passion sweep through him? Man was constrained to ask himself this question not merely from introspection and the consciousness of the tumult within, but from a study *ab externo* of the aspect of his fellows—what more mobile, what less stable than this same figure of humanity! If, therefore, outward observation brought conviction that man himself was under the dominance of the 'pneuma,' this conviction gathered force as the inner

consciousness added its testimonies. Looking back, the fullness of thought of the old Stoic teaching and its comprehensiveness is borne in upon us, and we recognize what the Pneuma or World-Soul did actually stand for in those far-off times. Expressed in present-day terms it included first the doctrine of force, its conservation and correlation; next the doctrine of the vital or germinating principle—of this, the λόγος σπερματικός, the whole organic world bore witness; thirdly the doctrine of the inner or subjective world, the Psyche.

The last named stands quite apart, for however mysterious the working of the vital principle, however secret the association between matter and force, both belong to the category of objective phenomena; contrariwise the Psyche is unapproachable objectively, since neither the corporeal, attenuate it as we will, can come near it, nor can any conceivable parallelogram or parallelopipedon of forces evoke it as resultant.

But the doctrine of Pneuma went further still; it claimed to reach back to the beginnings of time when, as an emanation of itself, Primitive substance or essence, all things issued forth; it spoke of a time, antedating even the creation, when Pneuma, 'the everlasting presupposition of particular things,' alone existed, and it looked forward to a time when all things should decay, should revert to, and become one with, that primitive substance whence they had issued. Thus this old philosophy fashioned its unknown God and referred all things to Him, foreshadowing the theologies which now hold the world; thus along this old-time pathway we arrive again at the primal thesis: 'In the beginning God created all things.'

Of this doctrine it is important to establish the authority which belongs to it as a fundamental tenet of the Churches and the Philosophies (accepting the term First Cause as the philosophers' nearest approach to God), because the argument to be developed will depend in part upon the affirmation that the creation has not only the sanction of God, but His very sign-manual—the heavens declaring His glory, and the firmament shewing His handiwork.

From this primal premiss, however, as has been stated, man has ever tended and still tends to stray; and this happens the more often, the more intently he looks at the created, the wonder of it being so great that vision is apt to stay at the thing seen. This is the history of mankind from the past until now, the history of a swaying to and fro between the thing made and its Creator, between the Soma and the Pneuma, between Matter and Spirit. Now, at one time, it is the corporeal which is in the ascendant; this may be and probably is coincident with a period of great material industry and progress, the soul being then, in the words of Marivaux, at the windows of the body, engrossed in gazing at outward things. Now, at another time, the soul turning unsatisfied from the seen, is wrapt in contemplation of things within, looks through and beyond the corporeal, and has visions of the Spiritual Presence. Alas, man lacks wisdom. When the material is in the ascendant he fails to find time for reflexion and dismisses the invisible as negligible, treating as unimportant that which he has not chosen to regard with the inner eye. Next, when the spiritual is dominant, he is apt to disregard the things of sense and to treat with scant courtesy that Soma which he wears, and which was given him to study and care for. There is the story of a saint who, passing through a scenery of surpassing beauty, saw none of it, his eyes, focussed for the infinite, giving only blurred images of the finite. There is the story of another saint whose spirit, strong winged, could make its direct flight upwards, the body seemingly cast aside, yet who also knew another way to God, to which every part of His creation gave access. This man never tired of contemplating and worshipping the Creator in the creature, for, as he sang in his 'Canticle of the Sun':

'Di te, Altissimo, porta significatione.'

Let us take this wise saint for guide and consider awhile the physical universe, and let us postulate:

(*a*) That Matter and Force deriving from God borrow His Divinity;

(*b*) That having received the divine impetus at the creation, that impetus must until the end of time continue to be a divine act, just as much as it was at the beginning; in other words, that from the beginning to the end material evolution is God's own predetermined operation;

(*c*) That material processes have in themselves no moral or religious bearing; that in them is neither virtue nor vice, but the staging only upon which virtue and vice have to play their part—in brief, that Physics are not and never can be Ethics.

These postulates granted, suppose now that we look at some specific material process, *e.g.* the segmentation of the fertilized ovum. The start is made with one cell; signs of a division make their appearance, the protoplasm cleaves, and behold—two cells. The cleavage continues, the two become four, the four eight, and so forth, until a heap of cells have derived from the one parent cell. It has been said by some one that, as we watch the process, it is as if we stood by and saw the working of some hidden artificer, marking, dividing, shaping. And so, indeed, it is; we stand in the laboratory of the Great Artificer; it is Himself we see marking, dividing, shaping, for these operations are consequent directly upon the properties He has bestowed upon matter. As we follow the sequences which the busy vital principle displays before us, we gather conviction that these same sequences are inevitable, as inevitable as the path of the resultant of a given field of forces, or the lines of separation of a crystal from the mother liquid. Thus, back to God, we refer physiology in its length and breadth and depth, and see in its processes Divine necessity.

But what of those processes which we label 'morbid,' those material dissensions, as they seem to be? Are they really discords in the general harmony of Nature? *Minime, minime*, not the least in the world—they are part of The Scheme and assuredly under His aegis. They are part of the staging also upon which man lives his higher life, and the term morbid as signifying depraved is conventional only. We shall see here great beauty if we look closely.

Let us grant that we are so constituted that the sight of a man in the grip of a painful disease is distressing to us, that the spectacle of a Lazarus is loathsome; that we are repelled and hurt by these aspects as we are burnt by fire. But, approaching more nearly, let us call the microscope to assist, and look, for instance, at the steps of an inflammation; we shall then become aware of a wonderful working, which more often than not is protective, *i.e.* to the welfare of that body which, consciously or unconsciously, of malice aforethought or unwittingly, has crossed the path of some natural force, which we must call antagonistic. In exemplification let us say that we cross the path of a travelling bullet, or that we come within striking distance of an infection, as when we volunteer to serve in a plague district, or to minister to a leper house: we shall then see the stricken body react to the hostile forces in a marvellous way, bringing up reserve after reserve of defensive mechanisms, and often triumphing in the end over odds seemingly overwhelming. It is needless to go minutely into this matter: suffice it to say that the adaptation of the organism to meet the incidence and accidence of disease has been so manifest from all time that no less comprehensive a term than *Vis medicatrix naturae*, the healing power of Nature, could be found to describe it adequately. Is there anyone who will deny the natural healing powers of the body? If there is, certainly it will not be the man of science, who has looked and has seen and has been so impressed that he has formulated as primary precept of his Art '*primum non nocere*'; in which maxim he tells us that we are to see to it, in the first place, that therapeutic measures do not interfere with the natural healthward bias of the tissues. And if it is not the man of Science who doubts, surely it will not be the Christian to whom such evidence of provision and prevision will be of a piece with his theory of a divine creation. Will he not see here with Saint Francis, and with him repeat '*di te, Altissimo, porta significatione*'?

Should the evolutionist exclaim, Nay, but these protective processes, inflammatory and other, which you thus extol, have been *evolved*, in the course of ages, by countless trials:

suppose we grant this, what of it? Is this evolution anything more than the unfolding of the divine intention as the impetus which God imparted has pulsed through His fabric? Do we imagine that in these countless trials new endowments were bestowed upon matter, or do we not rather believe that at each trial the original unchanged properties of matter wrought? No, evolution will not shake our faith in the persistence unchanged of the primal endowments of matter. Shall this faith in the continuous presence of God in Nature, even in that which we call disease, be unacceptable to the Christian Scientist?

But here is a difficulty. We speak of the salutary working of the inflammatory process: is it always so? Is the *vis naturae* always *medicatrix*? Certainly it is not, and we must admit that we have here a mystery. At times the natural reaction of the tissues to the morbid influence seems clearly to aggravate this influence and to lead not healthwards, but by the shortest road to death—death of the whole or death of the part. Take, for instance, a case of diphtheria: here the inflammatory reaction takes place as in other cases, and, as in them, it tends to oppose and destroy the '*materies morbi*' (in this case the bacillus and its poisons). So far so good, and the '*vis naturae*' is '*medicatrix*'; but, unfortunately, the contest is being fought out in a narrow place, and there is not room for it. In a limb the steps of the inflammation could proceed securely, but in the air way, at the glottis, life is in straits to begin with, and a little swelling of the looser tissues of the larynx, a little exudation on to the surface, and there is no longer room for life to pass—death threatens instantly. Again, take the case of disease of the eyeball in that form known as acute glaucoma: here the reaction to the exciting cause, whatever its nature, cannot find sufficient space to operate owing to the unyielding nature of the outer covering of the eyeball; in consequence, if left to itself, the tension rises so rapidly within the globe of the eye that the delicate retina spread out over its inner surface is destroyed, as rapidly, by the pressure. These two examples of a *vis lethalis naturae* may suffice—what conclusion do we draw

from them? That they are part of the great mystery of Death itself, which is set in our midst, part therefore of the staging of life; and that we must leave unsolved these part mysteries until we see less darkly in the mirror and more of the whole plan; noting, however, to our immediate comfort, that, to set against these lethal tendings of nature, there is the intelligence of man unto which they are opportunities for the practice of his healing art, a timely tracheotomy or iridectomy, as the case may be, saving the life of the whole or of the part. Thus these ways of death admit of diversion into paths of life by the hand of man, and of it, as of the intelligence guiding it, we may say again: '*di te, Altissimo, porta significatione.*'

Let us note, then, that these processes of nature, in that phase which we term morbid, are in the one case for us to follow and promote, in the other to oppose or divert; that in neither case do we initiate anything, but wait only upon the activities of the living plasma, directing those activities; that in every case these morbid sequences furnish opportunities for the operation of the intelligence of man.

To see the harmonies of disease has required much patient consideration, for, on the face of things, disease is a disorder and an undoing; hence it is not to be wondered at that the more obvious aspect has absorbed attention, and that, inasmuch as pain in some form or other is a general accompaniment of disease, this should have been regarded first as an infliction to be borne, and then as a penalty or chastisement for some wrong committed. It has remained for the 'Christian Scientist' to class sin and sickness together as owning a similar nature, and to make us morally responsible for the sickness as for the sin. It will be difficult to reconcile this latter view with the view of an underlying harmony in every form of disease, yet this last cannot be escaped. To accentuate this let us give one other example, selecting from the list of diseases one of the most formidable and malignant, viz. epithelial cancer. Look at it as it invades the lip or the tongue; observe the hard infiltrated tissues, more or less ulcerated, and the neighbouring infected

glands; know the mortal significance of these shewings, and then admire, if you can. Bring, however, the lens to your aid, and you will see a most beautiful epidermic cell evolution beneath the grosser manifestations which have so shocked you. It comes then to this: the tissues in health stand for one kind of harmony, disease implanted stands for another kind of harmony—the two act and react and, as we say, conflict, but from the rivalry a new harmony arises, must arise, since every molecular movement will be calculable and according to law. The resultant harmony God alone can see, for man can note only that for him the outcome may be pain, disablement, or Death, and upon this an exchange of the known for the unknown, from which instinctively he shrinks. But whether this exchange be to his advantage or not how can he decide, until the significance of Death itself has been revealed to him? As wise man he will be content to adjourn that discussion, comforting himself with this reflexion, that look where he will, so he look deeply enough, he will see nothing to shake his faith in the presence of God in Nature, from end to end, since everywhere he finds a full harmony.

Has sickness, then, no relation to sin? In itself none whatever. Sickness is a physical sequence which, given the data, is inevitable. Sin has to do with choice, with intention; but here in sickness is neither choice nor intention. Will not sin develop bodily sickness? It may, but so may virtue. I may in cowardice fly from the field of battle across the path of the travelling bullet, or heroically I may cross that same path to save the life of another: the same disease, identically, will follow upon the crossing. In the same way you may cross the path of an infection in an ignominious retreat from duty, or in a noble self-abnegation, and, given the same virulence of infection and the same lack of tissue resistance, you will succumb to the same disorder. Nature exhibits a magnificent disdain for motive, she is supremely indifferent to all else than the necessities impressed upon her. Just as the sun sheds its light impartially upon the righteous and unrighteous alike, so disease takes count neither of good

nor of bad. Sublime beyond conception as the cosmos is, from the jewelled Belt of Orion to the minutest earth grain, there is not in its whole material structure the counterpart of one moral iota—it is the Mind of God that we see and adore in the world of Nature, not His Heart—it is the platform which He has fashioned and upon which He has willed that the Moral Nature of Man shall play the Man. How magnificent must that nature be if this be scenic only!

From the standpoint of the objectivity of things a difficulty remains which must be faced. There are those who cast doubt upon the reality of the objective world; with a word, with the stroke of a pen, they cancel the material universe. What are we to say in reply? To those who take the view in its completeness, nothing: this is not the place nor is here the space to debate the matter; this, however, we would say, that the doctrine must be held in its entirety or not at all. Now it is in relation to disease in particular that the Christian Scientist has advocated this view: disease, he says, is not real, it is a figment of the imagination; it has only to be disbelieved in and it ceases to exist. What! this tumour has no existence? None! And this diphtheritic membrane which blocks the air way and is suffocating the patient? Nonsense, away with knife and forceps and tracheotomy tube, take away with them the belief in the existence of the blockage, and it is gone. How are we to meet this attitude of mind, for it must be remembered that the practical *raison d'être* of Christian Science is Disease, not Health? There is only one way to meet the situation, and that is to point out that the reality of Disease is neither more nor less than the reality of Health; to insist that this tumour is real only in the same sense that this limb is, this membrane of diphtheria as unreal only as the mucous membrane upon which it lies. 'Not because of muscular exercise, but by reason of the blacksmith's faith in muscle, his arm becomes stronger,' says Mrs. Eddy. What becomes stronger? The arm. Whose arm? The blacksmith's. Whose material utterance is this? Mrs. Eddy's. But arm, blacksmith, Mrs. Eddy, what are they to my five senses save material manifestations?

They have not one credential which does not belong to the tumour and the diphtheritic membrane, and if I am to disbelieve in the one, I *must* also disbelieve in the other; and away with arm, and blacksmith, and Mrs. Eddy.

With reference to the unreality of the material world, the point then which must be insisted upon is that the doctrine cannot be made partial. This will hold true for all men no matter what the religion or philosophy professed; but faith in a real objective world makes a special claim upon the Christian, for see where the negation of the reality of substance leads to: the opening chapter of the Book of Genesis must be rewritten, and in place of the usual text, each fiat must read: 'And God said, "Let there be," and there was *not*'; again, the words of Christ, 'Consider the lilies of the field,' how are we to read them? Must it not be, Consider them *not*? And the practice of Christ, did He make light of the infirmities of the flesh? Did He say to the blind man, 'There is nothing wrong with your eyes, only believe there is nothing wrong and you will see'? He said, it is true, 'only believe': this He never ceased to reiterate, but what was it that the maimed, and the halt, and the blind were to believe? In God and His power to heal even this darkened vision, this withered limb, which infirmities were not the sole possession of the afflicted, but were in the sight of all men; and for which manifest healings all men gave glory to God. Of course the injunction 'only believe' signified the predominance of the spiritual: that we shall come to; but the spiritual could not dominate unless it were over something—the mountain to be moved by faith would not have been the miracle promised except for the reality of its ponderous mass—*ecce quanta moles!* Nowhere does Christ cast doubt upon the reality of the world material; nay, does He not accentuate it rather in order to demonstrate a much more hidden thing, the reality of the world spiritual?

It may be objected that it is not fair to say that the Christian Scientist makes his doctrine partial, that nothing could be more universal than this statement: 'Matter will be finally proven to be nothing but a mortal illusion, wholly

inadequate to affect man through its supposed organic action or existence.' Without staying to analyze the meaning of this sentence, which first promises proof of a negative and then goes on to say that this negative will be *inadequate* (!), we may admit that it is a universal statement. But is this attitude of mind maintained? What is the meaning of these two hundred and odd phantom editions of *Science and Health*? Why health? This can have no more real existence than disease. What objection can be taken to the drug and the splint which does not hold equally for food and drink and raiment? What need can this non-existent body have for nourishment and covering if these accessories be real, *a fortiori* if they be illusory. Will any number of minus quantities make a plus? Apply the same objections, which are raised against the treatment of disease by material agencies, to the daily service of the body by food and drink and clothing, and will the Commonsense of Humanity tolerate for a single day such inept nullity? And in exchange for this emptiness, which every conscious fibre within us disowns, we are to give up the belief in the dual reality of matter and spirit which every conscious fibre confesses!

Probed, the doctrine of 'Mortal Mind,' the unique possession of 'Christian Science,' resolves itself into an unmeaning jargon, and to clear the senses let us for a moment ascend to 'the lone camp on Hardknots height,' with Wordsworth for our guide. With him let us look upon the sleeping flocks:

> '. . . calmly couching, while the nightly dew
> Moistened each fleece beneath the twinkling stars,'

and give our thanks to God for the realities of dew, and fleece, and twinkling star, and that serene air.

Having reached this point then, that God entered the material universe for all time at the moment when He fashioned it, and that hence every physical sequence is to be read as His way, we must proceed to consider that other primal existence, which the word Pneuma covered; which

word, however, connoted at first both the objective manifestation, Force, and the subjective manifestations conveyed by the words Consciousness, Spirit, Mind, Soul. It is the subjective element which alone shall concern us now, and for it we shall keep the term Psyche.

The association between Force and Matter was and is secret; but between the objective and the subjective it becomes clear, the more we ponder the mystery, that a great gulf is fixed, and that there is no hope of bridging it, for that the phenomena of the one order occupy a wholly different plane from those of the other order. The Psyche appears on the scene as I feel, I think, I will : there is no gainsaying, no getting behind this first manifestation of Being. All the forms of knowledge are in a sense inferential, depend upon processes of thought, are deducible as psychic sequences, must be learnt : this alone *is*. The subjective element is limited to the unit : consciousness cannot be transferred, cannot be lent or borrowed; in a sense the individual, one and undivided, alone exists, and the Cosmos shrinks to his dimensions. And yet the assurance of the individual in his own existence is no more fixed, no more fundamental than his assurance in the existence of an outside world, in which is comprehended the existence of fellow-beings, more real than the reflexions from the mirrors of a particular piece of externality, which is so inseparably associated with his own consciousness that he appropriates it as *his* body. Thus from the very beginning of the Earth life of the individual the Cosmos starts with *I*, *Thou*, and *It*. At the one end of existence (Birth) I, Thou, and It are small; as life proceeds to its natural term, the Cosmos expands; near the other end, Death, it shrinks again : then, I, Thou, and It are gone, so it seems, as they came, mysteriously.

The Psyche accompanies the body fitfully: this is inferential; at one moment it is here, at another it is gone. In sleep it may disappear wholly, more or less deeply below the surface, or it may emerge and appear more or less phantastically,—so we judge; but during our waking life it maintains no steadiness of flow, and sometimes even then seems to play at hide and seek,—so we infer. It attends upon

the bodily processes sometimes very engrossingly, intensely, as when the body takes on some new physical sequence, *e.g.* learns to walk or to play. As the sequence is repeated the Psyche becomes less and less attentive and wanders off to some other and newer sequence, and we say then that the task has been thoroughly learnt. The bodily process thenceforth is established as an automatic act; but we must remember that the Psyche is not gone, it is only beneath the surface, and for that same bodily process, upon occasion and in certain circumstances, the order which we have just witnessed, viz. Consciousness (more or less vivid), Consciousness (more or less faint), and Unconsciousness, may be reversed, and we shall witness the automatic act deserting the regions of the unconscious and becoming first subconscious and then fully conscious. In this way the Psyche wanders in and out of the planes of physical life.

Is the Psyche of the nature of a by-play? Does it look on only, bestowing its company, but taking no part in these physical sequences, which we have said are inevitable? Certainly not. The Psyche counts for something in the physical life, and we know it. How it works is inscrutably dark, but that it works is indisputably true. Desire, hope, faith—the Psyche in all its moods, with the attendant Will—play upon the body as upon an instrument: sow ambition in the heart of man, and see how the body will be impelled; plant hope there, and see how it will watch and wait; instil faith, and see how patiently the flesh will bear; fire with love, and see how it will glow and be transfigured.

The resultant of the physical sequence is *per se* inevitable, but add to this resultant the psychic factor and something new must issue: here we have at last the true Imponderables in these psychic factors. At one time it was the forces—heat, light, electricity—which were so named; they have long since been cast down from their pedestal, for do we not turn them this way and that, as we will, measure them to a nicety, and express them quantitatively in terms one of the other? What is the equivalent of this quantity of heat or electricity in motor power? So many foot-pounds.

Nothing could be more ponderable. But tell me of the force of attraction of Damon for Pythias, of Pythias for Damon !—robber bands could not withstand, swollen rivers stay, mountains forbid this force ; how many foot-pounds ? ! Poetry has sung the feats of Love, the Great Adventurer ; they are not of fancy, they are of fact, and Science must look into it. Other psychic factors are not less potent. Now an emotion sets a whole nation in movement ; now an ambition, served by a sovereign will, bends a people to its sway and a continent is in arms—how many foot-pounds in the impetus of these moving armies ? Quantivalence we find none when we ask the question. Some strange law of growth must underlie : we begin with Faith as a grain of mustard seed, and behold, in effect, its increment—the ponderous mountain is moved ! Marvellous enough is the material growth of the mustard seed ; so marvellous that it was likened unto the Kingdom of Heaven ; but the scientist in his presumption pretends that each step in that material growth is calculable or conceivably calculable, that each building up of cell to cell represents so much of force and matter, gathered up from sun and air and earth. Where, however, is the proportion between the psychic factor and the material effect ? According to what law does the ' germinating principle ' of the Psyche grow ? We recognize no proportion, no law, but we know that the *Logos spermatikos* is at work by its effects. We see them.

The dynamics of the psychic factor may be seen in gross, as when, mysteriously impelled, whole peoples migrate. Europe, for instance, is overrun by the Huns ; at such times we seem to see as in a mirror an Almighty Form ' glassing itself in tempests.' But the same Form may be seen in detail mirrored in the working of every part of the material economy of the individual man—seen, for instance, as an emotion, a disappointment, disturbing the functions of an organic tract, say the alimentary, the stomach turning from food with loathing or rejecting it violently ; or as a pleasurable excitement, the company of a friend, raising the digestive powers of the invalid to the level of health ; or again as a wakefulness, which besets the tired brain

moving sleepwards, upon the announcement of some unexpected news. Observe it again in the control of the strong will over a body racked with pain and seeking to express itself by the natural outlets of the cry, the shrinking, yet no sign given, and we shall note the psychic factor now initiating a physical sequence and now crying halt to a sequence not only prepared but actually started.

Looking at all these *facts* shall we not ask ourselves, What may not this unknown force effect when it begins to materialize itself, or rather what limits we in our ignorance are justified in setting to its powers?

This conclusion we arrive at from the observation of the working of the psychic factor in the normal life of Humanity at large, and of the individual Man: the same conclusion is enforced when we proceed to consider the phenomena of life in states we term abnormal, whether these states arise unsought (the state of hysteria), or are purposely evoked (the hypnotic state). In the hysterical state we see a perversion of the bodily functions, such that nearly every form of disease is simulated: the mind projects itself into every conceivable part of the body, conjuring up there so clear a make-believe of disease that the most expert physicians and surgeons have been deceived; wherefrom it has resulted, at one time, that an operation has been performed upon parts which reveal perfect health, at another time that necessary operations have been foregone because the simulacrum has been diagnosed when the real thing was there. In this mimicry of organic changes which hysteria puts upon the stage, the symptoms are not merely subjective, they are boldly objective also. Take the phantom tumours, the joint affections, the contracted limbs, the uncontrolled movements, simulating, say, St. Vitus' Dance; take the visceral manifestations of hysteria; take even the chemistry of the tissues, and see in a perverted metabolism, or (according to the best authorities) in an actual rise of the thermometer, the expression of a psychic state. The disease in these cases severally is not in the outworks of the body; it is not in the cerebro-spinal axis, not even in the pineal gland,

though at one time philosophers lodged the soul there: all these parts are really peripheral, or at any rate peripheral to this affection, the locus of which is somewhere at the core of the psychic being. And the origin of it all? Perhaps an ambition thwarted, a natural interest withdrawn, an affection gone astray: verily the probings of Science do not lessen the mystery of this body 'not built with hands' and that which it houses.

Not less inexplicable are the records of the hypnotic state, which figure also under the headings of Mesmerism, Animal Magnetism, Braidism. These records shew the strangest subservience of the body to the will of the operator, exerted on certain ascertained lines. The abolition of pain by means of Suggestion, and the practical application of this discovery to operative surgery, was established by Esdaile before the discovery of chloroform and its congeners; but this field of knowledge is too extensive and has been too much laboured for us to study its abundant yield here. Suffice it to say that under certain conditions the body of the subject becomes plastic to the will of the operator, feels or does not feel, moves or is still, takes upon faith the dictum of the hypnotizer, and, however grotesque this dictum, proceeds to act upon it; in brief, lends itself to be acted upon as is willed—*up to a point.* More remarkable still: the suggestion implanted does not disappear with the hypnotic state, but outlasts it for a longer or shorter period, and so may continue to act in the daily life of the patient.

If we should seek to explain these phenomena by 'thought transference' we should be simply restating the fact, granting that it be such: we should not be unfolding the nature of things; but we cannot take refuge in this pretence, for when the operator tells the subject that the house is on fire, and sets him busy at its extinction, or deludes him with some other idle fancy, he, the operator, is not the victim of his own words, and cannot therefore transfer that which he does not possess. Reichenbach gave the name of 'odic' force to the power operating in the hypnotic state. It does not matter what we call it so long as we recognize its existence and its potencies, and that its operation is entirely

independent of any religious belief or philosophy, whether on the part of the operator or the subject. It is a natural phenomenon and one which must be reckoned with in the interpretation of the phenomena of subjective and objective life, both in the state of health and of disease. Does it not become abundantly clear that until more light is thrown upon the hypnotic state and the facts of hysteria and the whole group of the neuroses, it behoves us to walk very warily and to hesitate to place any phenomenon outside the limits of this natural magic? No one at this time of day will raise the question, What end can hypnotism serve? and ask doubtingly whether we had not better shut our eyes to these seemingly capricious behavings of Nature. Franklin was once asked, in respect of electricity in its infantile days—What might its use be? The answer came, What is the use of a baby? Make it of use. His advice was followed, and the electric toy became the electric engine. Hypnotic suggestion unquestionably is a force, and it must therefore have its field of legitimate use, as certainly as that its power, diverted from the proper paths, may work disaster. Much is being done in the study of the therapeutic value of Suggestion, and the drawbacks which may attend its use; but we are still in the very early days both of comprehension and full utilization.

We have reached this point then that, on the one hand, there is the objective physical world with its inexorable sequences (laws), on the other hand, the psychic factor which mysteriously enters the field of these sequences and works there, sometimes co-operating, sometimes conflicting, and presenting us with strange happenings; that we have no means of measuring this psychic factor, *i.e.* of establishing a definite quantitative relation between the cause and the effect, cannot, for instance, pronounce the co-efficient of the psychic factor to be such and such, in terms of momentum —cannot give its value in foot-pounds; that yet we must count the psychic factor as a natural force, noting further that its operation is independent of any philosophical or religious tenet, inasmuch as it works in the absence of

these; that this, however, is not to say that Ethics and Religion when present do not use it, for indeed it is universally recognized that in proportion as Ethics and Religion are strong, the dominance of the psychic factor is manifest —all history proves this.

These propositions granted, must we not recognize that the Natural still holds much more of the occult than of the manifest, and that the pronouncement 'supernatural' must be made with the utmost caution? Must we not further concede such workings as are expressed by the terms 'Mind cure' and 'Metaphysical healing' to be part and parcel of the Scheme of Nature?

Stated thus, is the problem of Being complete? Not for those who believe in a First Cause; *a fortiori* not for those who give to that First Cause the attributes of a God; least of all for those whose God is the God of the Christian. The argument addresses itself henceforth to these three classes of men; it can have no force for those who in their conceptions cannot get outside of Nature. Is Science incompatible with the belief in a God? Let Newton and Pascal answer. For all Christians, then, who hold that it is impossible to probe the secrets of Nature too deeply, to have, that is, too much of Science; for these what is the complete problem of existence? The complete problem adds to the working elements already recognized the presence of a Creator and the power of that Creator to re-enter His creation at will. One must say *re*-enter, for the devout Scientist believes that at the creation He did so enter once and for all time; and for the Christian man of Science the problem is simply this: that the Creation being finite whilst the Creator is infinite, there remain infinite possibilities of further revelations, further creative acts, if you will. The Scientist must face this question squarely: there is no eluding it. If he be a Christian he must, as a man of Science, admit, that to exclude God from His creation, to make Nature paramount, is utterly unscientific, utterly illogical. How can the created set limits to the Creator; to imagine such is to make nonsense of the term 'create.' It is, however,

quite another thing to imagine that if God re-enter His creation and change a given sequence He thereby abrogates His own antecedent act; but this is no necessary deduction. The position will be neither more nor less than this, that He introduces a new factor, which, working with the other factors that He had already set in operation, time was, gives us a new result. It is, then, not that He cancels Himself, but that He reveals Himself more fully. Can any Scientist and Christian traverse this position? If he cannot, then the problem of Being in its mystery is raised to the n^{th} power of potential. The belief in this infinite potentiality we confess in the opening words of the Creed when we acknowledge Him as the Creator of All Things visible and invisible, and at the same moment own His Allmight. Now, with this accession, the belief in the infinite possibilities of Faith Cure must be logically conceded; now, indeed, Faith as a grain of mustard seed begins to grow. We read that at one time in the history of the Church, not a time of great spiritual fervour, miracles became inconveniently numerous, to the serious dislocation of social and political life; so much so that it became necessary to meet the situation by royal edict. At which time might be read here or there:

> 'De par le Roi—Défense à Dieu
> de faire miracle en ce lieu.'

Are we to read, written across the face of Nature, this interdict, and in the name of Science? Yet that is the position of the man of Science who professes his belief in God whilst closing to Him every means of access to His own creation.

The next step to be taken is this—granted this power of divine re-entry and all that it includes, the miracles in the past, the possible miracles in the future—does it follow that this supernatural way is better than the natural way, is a higher order of things, and if so, why? Why, indeed! For whether God permit His own established ordering to prevail, or, by re-entering, ordain a new way, is it not equally His way? It is necessary to insist upon this, for the attitude

of mind of not a few would seem to be that the old order, the natural order, is upon a lower plane than the supernatural manifestation. Against this view the man of Science will not cease to protest: he has been busy all his life studying the ways of God, as revealed in His creation, and the more his faith in their divine ordering has been confirmed, the more he will resent as irreverent this treatment of Nature; and his protest will be in the name of God Himself.

Then why the miracle? Is that question really before us? It seems almost an irreverence to put it, but quite simply may one venture thus far, that since the supernatural manifestation must have or have had a purpose, one such purpose might be to admonish and teach man by recalling to his mind the God he had banished from His own works: 'Excepting ye see signs and wonders ye will not believe'?

'*Non haec humanis opibus*'! Yet if our eyes were not blinded by custom we should see and worship God as clearly in each commonplace of Nature as in the most astounding miracle.

From the 'Mind Cure' and the 'Metaphysical Healing' we have now advanced to the 'Faith Cure,' and have accepted its abstract *reasonableness* as beyond scientific questioning—granted a Creator. But, admitting the reasonableness, we have still to ask, Is it here in our midst? Do we see it nowadays? In speaking thus we mean the 'Faith Cure' as shewn objectively, in a supernatural physical sequence. The only answer can be, that experiment alone, observation alone, can decide this. When, therefore, the Faith healer comes and claims a supernatural order of things, he must produce his credentials, must shew that this event could not have happened naturally. In asking for these credentials the man of Science is only pleading God's cause, as he understands it, as it has been revealed to him in Nature: he is therefore doing his simple duty and no more. Now the answer of Science to this question as to the present-day existence of the material faith cure is surely 'not proven'; and lest it be

thought that this is a biased expression of opinion, let us quote from Dr. Elwood Worcester, of Emmanuel Church, Boston, in his introduction to *Religion and Medicine*.[1] He says there : ' at all events an authentic instance of recovery from organic disease by psychical means is what we are waiting for.' This statement, coming from one who is among the foremost in a religious movement for the utilization of the spiritual powers of the Christian Church in the treatment of the sick, should be authoritative when conjoined with the pronouncements of the scientific world.

The task, then, which the Faith healer must set himself is to strive by every means at his disposal to establish the instance of the organic cure by the psychical method. He can do no more and no less, for the question is one of demonstration, not of argument. To this end he must co-operate with the man of Science, must get from him the certification of the case as organic, for without this essential preliminary demonstration will not be possible. Then he must proceed to shew the spiritual effect. As concrete examples of the class of case which he must be prepared to treat we may give the fractured or dislocated limb, the paralyzed and withered arm or leg (as of infantile paralysis), the case of deafness from ulcerative processes in the middle ear, of blindness from cataract, the malignant tumour, the abscess, the case of chronic Bright's disease, the case of valvular disease of the heart. Purposely the most pronounced forms of organic disease have been selected, but this should not dismay the Christian Scientist, for these, he tells us, are phantom manifestations of a phantom body : be it so, will he then at least dispel for us these illusions? For the Faith healer who takes a more reasonable view, more in conformity, that is, with our innermost convictions, even these cases should not be outside the power of God to heal in His own way : this we have admitted, and that no less a Faith can satisfy us ; still the Faith healer must be prepared to shew this miracle by excluding the possibility of operation by natural ways and means.

Disease, however, is not wholly organic—we know it ;

[1] P. 4.

and we know, moreover, that though organic changes be plain to view, the worst of diseases even then may be psychical. On the other hand, there is a very large group of disorders which lack a demonstrated organic basis, yet the reality of which cannot be questioned —such are the functional neuroses. The power of these disorders to occasion distress and inhibit the higher life of the body is very real, and the call which they make upon the healing art correspondingly urgent. The comparative powerlessness of drugs *per se* in a large proportion of these cases is well recognized, whilst the power of advice, of encouragement, of reassurance is so evident that no physician worthy of the name would forego the psychic factor. Accordingly he weights or dynamizes the prescription with these imponderables, more subtile than the most infinitesimal of Hahnemann's dilutions, yet more potent than momentum multiplied into momentum a thousandfold. It may be said that in so doing the physician employs 'suggestion': he does, and he does it deliberately in the interests of the patient, nor will he ever misuse this power intentionally if he make the welfare of the patient the touchstone of its use; bearing always in mind that the patient is compounded of psyche and soma, and that the cure of the body must never be at the expense of the spirit.

In this region of disease there is a large field for the wise use of the 'Mind Cure,' the 'Metaphysical healing,' the ethical counsel, the 'Faith Cure,' and it is in this field of psychotherapy that, as Dr. Worcester says, 'all its real triumphs have been won.'

Does this leave room for the influence of the Church in the treatment of the sick? Indeed it does: it opens the door wide to the most powerful of all spiritual forces, Religion. It takes a soul to move a body; it takes Religion to raise to its highest that same soul: what will this lever not lift? To demarcate and apportion strictly is not possible here; it is within the power of each, layman or cleric, to minister to each, giving ghostly counsel, and so it must fall to the physician of the body to enter upon the domain of the spirit, especially to the physician who has made a

study of the subtler problems of the mind and the emotions. The nature of man is spacious enough, yet not so filled that it can spare the ministrations of the physician of the soul; to him it must look to evoke those higher harmonies of the Psyche to which the Body is designed to vibrate in unison.

It may be difficult to demonstrate the supernatural in these dim regions which the Psyche haunts, because the natural itself is so obscure; but we must not hesitate on this account to strive to utilize to our utmost the psychic factor. Much we shall have to take upon trust—Faith would never have been if demonstration had been possible; but if demonstration could have been substituted, the gain in scientific store would have left us poorer by one virtue of highest price.

How stand we then—what are we? We are 'a little flesh, and breath, and the ruling part'; and the 'ruling part' rules and constrains 'the little flesh and breath' to attest its faith in a twofold reality, of the world subjective and of the world objective, the reality of the spirit and the reality of something else which we call matter, including therein force; its faith also that these two verities are linked in us. This faith involves that that which should touch us, should minister to us, must be akin, must in like manner be twofold, spirit and matter. For the 'ruling part' the spiritual; for the 'little flesh and breath' its material kith and kin. George Herbert saw this and told us that herbs gladly cure our flesh 'because that they find their acquaintance there.' Among the lilies of the field the foxglove stands and shakes its bells and declares its beauty, and as we were told to do, so we do: we consider this outward grace, and we wonder. That wonder deepens as consideration teaches us that the outward fashion of the flower covers hidden powers which prove healing virtues. Then we think we see—can we be mistaken?—a further revelation of Divine ordering in the first great Scheme of Creation.

'For the ruling part' the spiritual; for the 'flesh and breath' the material; but because in Man these are

linked, therefore the full ministration to Man must be of Spirit and Matter.

A last word: in this Faith is there new wine requiring new wine-skins, or will the old wine-skins serve? Do we need a new Church or does the old Church call for a new name? Sympathizing to the full with the earnest endeavour and wise restraint which is manifest in such movements for a larger utilization of the spiritual forces of the Christian Church as that which has been started by the Emmanuel Church, Boston, we are yet constrained to ask these questions. The Emmanuel Church movement 'bears no relation to Christian Science, either by way of protest or of imitation, but it would have been what it is had the latter never existed.' These are among the concluding words of the Introduction to *Religion and Medicine*, and they are clearly true. The movement has taken its 'stand fairly and squarely on the religion of Christ,' and with this it has combined a reverence for the study of Nature and a recognition of the gifts bestowed by 'the power of genuine science'; but 'genuine science' comes of the study of Nature, of the consideration of the lilies of the field, and therefore in this respect also the movement is Christian, and the Wine which it proffers is not new wine, but Old Wine from an Old Skin. By raising anew the question, whether we are now, at the present day, utilizing the abundant ethereal potencies of this Wine, as we ought, the Emmanuel Church movement and any kindred movement are doing good service,

'Qui utuntur vino vetere, sapientes puto';

but no new name is called for.

In respect of 'Christian Science' itself, in so far as it desires to exalt the Spirit, we can only admire its aim, but we fail to comprehend upon what grounds it bases its claim to be a science, and in so far as it belittles the material Universe, and so makes light of God's creation, how it can reconcile this with Christianity; here indeed we can only deplore the lack of insight and the irreverence.

HARRINGTON SAINSBURY.

Art. IV.—SCREENS AND ROODLOFTS.

1. *Screens and Galleries in English Churches.* By Francis Bond. (London: Henry Frowde. 1908.)
2. *Roodscreens and Roodlofts.* By F. Bligh Bond, F.R.I.B.A., and the Rev. Dom Bede Camm, O.S.B. Two volumes. (London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd. 1909.)

The setting apart of special buildings for purposes of religious worship, and of particular parts of these buildings for the most sacred rites, appears to have been the usual practice wherever and whenever there has been any kind of religion. Even the stone circles of prehistoric ages appear to bear witness to the feeling that has always resulted in religious enclosures, though we know nothing of the religion that was connected with them. The Greek temples were separated from the common land around them, at first by a string or rope, then by a more efficient fence, or even by a wall, answering to our churchyard wall. The entrance to this enclosure developed into the magnificent Propylaea of later times, and the sacred enclosure itself was called the *temenos* or *hieron*. Indeed the words *temenos* and *templum* are both derived from the same root and mean something 'cut off.' The great temples usually consisted of three parts: (1) the vestibule, (2) the *cella* or temple proper, the most sacred part, the special habitation of the deity represented by the statue there placed, and (3) the *opisthodomos* or back-chamber, which served as the treasury. Each of these portions was screened off from the one next to it by a solid wall. The Tabernacle or travelling Temple of the Israelites had (1) an outer enclosure surrounded by linen screens supported on pillars, with an entrance at the eastern end closed by curtains of embroidered linen, (2) the outer or eastern half of this enclosure, in which were placed the altar of burnt-offerings and the brazen laver. In the western half was (3) the temple or tabernacle itself, consisting of upright boards fitted together, and roofed in by

skins and hair-cloth. This structure was divided internally into two compartments: (4) the Holy Place, and (5) the Holy of Holies. The permanent temples that succeeded the tabernacle were essentially the same in their internal arrangements. The early Christians worshipped together wherever they best could, in private houses certainly, in Jewish *proseuchae* apparently, and in the catacombs, at any rate in those of the Jews. In the catacombs they have left their mark in countless inscriptions and pictures, and it has been supposed that the *arcosolia* or arched recesses over tombs were used for the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, the flat tombslabs serving for altars. The catacombs would at once acquire a special sanctity in the minds of the Christians, partly as containing the bodies of the martyrs, and partly from their association with the most sacred rites. As the Christians increased in number daily, and became a power in the State, they required buildings set apart for public worship, and they had such buildings long before the State recognition of Christianity under Constantine. In the Roman Empire Christianity was persecuted under some emperors, but tolerated or even sanctioned by others, up to the time of Constantine, and the Christians were always subject to mob-violence. Yet they certainly had their churches, which were sometimes buildings of considerable dimensions. The assertions of some of the early Christian writers that they had neither temples, altars, nor images, must mean only that they had not these in the Pagan sense, for there is positive evidence of the existence of churches in our sense in the third century. 'Temples' of Christian assemblies were destroyed in 292 A.D., and there are other testimonies of a like nature.[1] The edict of Diocletian (*c.* 302) ordered destruction of churches and confiscation of their lands. The church at Nicomedia, destroyed in 303 A.D., is described as quite a large building. There are some existing churches, parts of which have been supposed to date from the third century; but no certain date can be assigned

[1] Smith and Cheetham, *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, *s.v.* Church: F. Bond, *Gothic Architecture*, 145, and authorities there referred to.

to them, nor do they retain internal arrangements of that period. With the peace of the Church under Constantine came a great era of church building, and of some churches of that date or shortly after it we know much that is to our present purpose. Indeed, the Emperor himself built or helped to build magnificent churches, such as those of the Holy Sepulchre and of the Ascension at Jerusalem, probably the old St. Peter's with those of St. Agnes and the Lateran in Rome, and in the new Rome, now Constantinople, those of St. Irene (afterwards taken into that of the Holy Wisdom, called St. Sophia), St. Anne, and St. Michael. Now in the original basilica of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, the sanctuary was fenced off from the body of the church by a screen of twelve columns with capitals of silver, the prototype of the similar screen at St. Mark's, Venice, and of mediaeval roodscreens, and, indeed, of our later altar-rails. In old St. Peter's in front of the high altar were twelve columns in two rows of six each, forming a double screen. At Tyre, the great basilica, burned during Diocletian's persecution in 303, was restored by Constantine, with an enclosure of framed lattice-work to protect the holy altar from the multitude. The greater churches of this period were of two distinct types, the basilican and the circular or polygonal, and besides these were little chapels or oratories of various forms. So far as can be ascertained, it is certain that whatever was the form of the church, it had a sacrarium or apse in which stood the one and only altar that each church then possessed,[1] and which was protected or separated by some sort of a screen, the prototype of the screens described in the two works named at the head of this article. To that of Mr. Francis Bond we have already directed attention, and we now return to it more particularly in connexion with its

[1] The Greek and other Oriental churches have even now, as in primitive times, only one altar in each church, and it was the same in the old Ambrosian rite. Even in the Duomo at Milan, begun in 1386, there are no constructional chapels. Plurality of altars in the West generally seems to date from the sixth century.

immediate successor on the same subject. Each work begins with a dissertation on the origin of screens, in which each author lays more special stress upon different points, and before passing on to the main contents of their books, we propose to give a brief *résumé* of what they say concerning the origins. Mr. Francis Bond points out that the first enclosures we hear of, which were in churches built by Constantine or soon after his time, were railings of wood or of bronze, known to us only by descriptions as no examples of them remain. In the earliest examples that have survived, the screen takes the form of a colonnade, as it did in old St. Peter's at Rome, and elsewhere. These colonnades may be of the sixth century. They probably superseded earlier and simpler rail-fences.

A beam of silver or of wood plated with silver, possibly a rood-beam, was presented by Leo III (795–816) to old St. Peter's, and presumably there were earlier beams of wood. Such a beam in a wide apse arch (or Arch of Triumph, as it was called) would require supports to keep it from sagging in the middle, and these supports would take the form of columns, as they did at old St. Peter's. Thus would the beam be converted into the cornice of a screen, which would be at once altar-railing and screen. Many uses for the beam have been suggested, as for instance to serve for the suspension of lamps, and of curtains or veils, or for the support of standing lights and reliquaries, above all, for a cross (or, later, a crucifix) with the attendant ' Mary and John,' with sometimes two cherubims as well.

We first find these figures definitely mentioned about the time of the Norman Conquest, and their usual position was on the screen.

Now, in the earliest churches, the apse, which was at the west end, was attached directly to the nave, but as the need for a quire was more strongly felt, the western portion of the nave, that next to the altar, was screened in by a low enclosure of marble slabs, as in St. Clement's in Rome and many other early churches. Even so late as 1174 there was a wall of marble slabs surrounding

Ernulph's quire at Canterbury, at the base of the pillars.

We have spoken of the colonnade in front of the altar; in Sta. Maria in Cosmedin at Rome both this colonnade and the low enclosure round the quire are found together, and Mr. Francis Bond thinks that the next step was to consolidate these two parts, the colonnade being moved backward to the ritually 'western,' but actually eastern end of the quire-enclosure. This arrangement appears at first sight to obtain at Torcello, and the colonnade with low panels between the columns and the front of a loft supported by them would form what we now understand by a roodloft, but there is now no real loft, only the front of one. The next step, taken as early as the ninth century, was to elongate the apse so as to form an eastern limb capable of accommodating the quire, and then the screen was placed in the 'Arch of Triumph,' or, as we should now say, in the chancel arch. We come in the next place to the evolution of the quire-screen in England. In two of the earliest English churches of which we have the requisite knowledge, those of Reculver and of St. Pancras at Canterbury, there were certainly chancel-screens formed of three round arches resting on columns that were probably procured from Roman buildings; but in other churches of the same period, where columns could not conveniently be made or found ready-made, three arches resting on piers were made in the wall between the nave and the chancel, and this triple chancel arch may be regarded as a lineal successor of the beam and column screen of old St. Peter's, and a lineal ancestor of our present quire-screens. There is, however, no evidence that the triple arches were 'screens' as we understand the term; it has been suggested that the early builders may have made three small arches because they could not so conveniently make a single broad one, but this seems hardly likely.

After the seventh century the triple arch was replaced by a single arch. In these Anglo-Saxon churches the rood may have been set on a beam or screen within the central or sole arch or, as seems to have been the case at

Bradford-on-Avon, fixed to the wall above it. In the thirteenth century the triple arch occasionally reappears, but it was eventually superseded by the single arch with screen, loft, and rood. How early these fittings came in cannot be ascertained, but at any rate they were coming into use in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, at first the rood and rood-beam, and in time, if not at first, the beam would receive supports and become a screen. Mr. Francis Bond thus sums up his conclusion :

> 'The origin of the mediaeval quire screen is twofold. Partly it is to be found in altar-fences, whether railings or colonnades, partly in low parapets forming quire enclosures, both parapet and colonnade being ultimately combined in one, and placed at the entry to the chancel : of such an arrangement the triple chancel arch of the seventh century Anglo-Saxon churches may be regarded as a survival. Partly it is to be found in the necessity of providing supports for a rood-beam, which should carry a cross or crucifix, lamps, reliquaries, curtains, etc. The rood-beam with its supports developed in Italy into a colonnade ; in England into the quire screen of oak or masonry.'

According to another view, to be referred to more particularly in connexion with the work of Mr. Bligh Bond and Dom Bede Camm, the screen is to be traced to the veils drawn round the altar both in East and West to conceal the act of consecration. In the Eastern churches generally this usage crystallized in the *iconostasis*, but the Armenians retain the altar-veil to this day. In Italy the same purpose was long effected by the *baldacchino*, and accordingly in that country there was no occasion for a quire-screen, and we rarely see one there. The act of consecration now takes place ' before the people ' throughout the Western churches, altar-veils having long gone out of use. The mediaeval Lenten veil is a different thing, and cannot represent the quire-screen, as every church had both veil and screen occupying different positions. Others would refer the origin of the quire-screen and loft to the Epistle and Gospel ambos, connected by a platform. But there is no evidence for the use of ambos in England, nor of

the loft, before the fourteenth century; the loft, supposed on this view to represent the ambos, was added to the screen, not the screen to the loft.

Whatever its origin, the screen was of great practical use. When chancel arches were made wider, two side-altars that had previously stood against the walls at the sides of the arch, were now placed against the screen within the arch. When aisles and transepts were added in the thirteenth century, the side-altars were commonly removed to these, though in many cases they were not transferred but their number was increased, while, as the use of lofts came in, the screens were wanted for their support, whether used as reredoses or not.

The first chapter of Mr. Francis Bond's book, which we have now reviewed, is wholly on the origin of screens. Chapter II, which occupies more than three-fourths of the whole volume, is on Chancel Screens and Galleries in Parish Churches, considered under twenty-three heads, as Plan of Screens, Presbytery Screens, Parclose Screens, Stone Screens, etc., and we can only say that all the matters indicated in the Table of Contents are treated in a very complete and interesting manner, as well as being beautifully illustrated. The introductory remarks with which this chapter begins will commend themselves to most of our readers, at any rate. The author insists on the artistic value of screens, even if they be only rude frameworks of common deal, as adding to the feeling of 'mystery,' suggesting beautiful and holy things beyond, so as to 'keep,' as Wordsworth says,

'That modest grace of not too much;—Part seen, *imagined part.*'

We do not want to have a perfectly clear view of everything all at once, as in a shop window.[1] We know of a fine parish church in which a simple pitch-pine screen was set up many years ago, with very great advantage to the general effect of the interior. It has now been replaced by a costly oak screen designed by Mr. C. Hodgson Fowler, for which screen

[1] See the admirable remarks on 'mystery' in Ruskin's *Modern Painters*, extracted in *Frondes Agrestes*, (6th edit. 1882), pp. 45, 46.

it prepared the way, while in itself it was infinitely better than no screen at all, and all the better as not being in any way pretentious or professing to be anything but a make-shift. Nothing adds so much to the apparent length of a church as a screen, nothing diminishes the effect of length so much as to remove a screen. Then again a great east window, whether plain or coloured, was never meant to be seen from the nave all at once. It looks infinitely better as seen beyond a screen, as now at York and Selby beyond the reredos, though, of course, if we wish to examine the windows in detail, we can go up to them. Mr. Francis Bond quotes Pugin as saying that 'the man who professes to love Gothic architecture and does not like screens, is a liar,' and certainly no one who dislikes screens can really have taken in what Gothic architecture is and means. In plan, the screen of course adapts itself to the plan of the church. It may extend only across the east end of the nave, but if there be chancel aisles, it may extend across them as well. Or, if there were no chancel aisles, chapels may be screened off at the ends of the nave aisles. In long chancels an extra screen was sometimes placed between the quire and the sacrarium or presbytery, hence called a presbytery screen. Altar-rails, however, as we understand them, were introduced soon after the Reformation, and were designed to guard against the flood of irreverence that came in with that great movement. There was no occasion for them before, though movable rails or benches may have been placed for the convenience of communicants.

The section on stone screens in Mr. Francis Bond's book is extremely interesting, and all the more so from their comparative rarity in parish churches. They appear to be clearly traceable to triple chancel arches, the earlier round, the later pointed, in a wall carried up to the roof. Then a cornice was run across immediately over the arches, and the space between that cornice and a great chancel arch left open, so that the three arches formed a screen on which the rood and figures might be set, with or without a loft. In the next place the arches were multiplied in number, so that at Bradford Abbas there are eight double

cusped arches, divided by mullions, besides the central one, which is much the widest and trebly cusped, the general effect being that of a massive wood screen. Lastly, the 'wooden' mode of construction in stone developed into beautiful designs filling up the whole of the chancel arch. These stone screens are again referred to below.[1]

We now pass on to the subject of Lofts, which came into use first in Cathedral and other 'great' churches, and then found their way into parish churches, where the doorways and spiral stairs that led to them still remain in many cases. Sometimes they must have been reached by wooden stairs, for we find the stone corbels for the loft in churches where there is no stone staircase. The lofts served for many purposes: the screen alone would have supported the figures. They were certainly used for the reading of the Epistle and Gospel, as the two ambos were in the early churches and are still where Vatican regulations have not crushed out all local usages. It has been truly said that vested priests or deacons could hardly get up the narrow stairs, but some lofts were provided with altars, and if a priest could celebrate in a loft, a subdeacon and deacon could also read the Epistle and Gospel there.

How they managed we do not know, but possibly, when the stairs were narrow, they may have vested in the loft, *coram populo*, as they certainly must have done in the chancel in the smaller churches, before the days of vestries. The vesting was a part of the ceremonial, as it still is in the case of Roman bishops pontificating. We can some of us remember seeing the rector putting on his surplice and taking it off in the chancel. In like manner the people might witness the vesting in the loft, and hear the words, 'Jube, domine, benedicere,' 'Pray, sir, a blessing,' addressed by the deacon to the priest just before reading the Gospel, which the Sarum and other missals expressly direct to be done on certain occasions *in Pulpito*, meaning (in the greater parish churches, at any rate) in the roodloft. From the reading

[1] P. 100.

of the Gospel *in Pulpito* it was an easy transition to the expounding of it or to other preaching in the same place, and then to the providing of a special *pulpitum* for preaching, hence our modern pulpit. So that the pulpit in the meeting-house is lineally descended from the mediaeval roodloft. And from 'Jube, domine, benedicere' comes the French term *Jubé* for a roodloft. In connexion with singing galleries, lineally descended no less than pulpits from the roodloft, Mr. Francis Bond gives some very interesting accounts of village quires in the days of wind and strings.

We have not space to say much about the two short chapters on screens of churches of secular canons, collegiate or cathedral, and those of churches of monks and canons regular. In the greater collegiate churches and in the Cathedrals of the old or secular foundation, the arrangement was, and is, much the same as in parish churches, namely, that the quire-screen usually stands in the arch leading into the quire, as at York, Lincoln, Ripon, etc., only that these screens are structures of solid stone with extensive lofts capable of carrying even the monster organs of modern times. Sometimes where the structûral quire was short the ritual quire was brought westward under the central tower, and the quire-screen placed in the western arch instead of in the eastern one. In churches formerly monastic, such as Canterbury, Peterborough, Durham, and other Cathedrals of 'the New Foundation,' there were two great screens, namely the pulpitum proper, as in the churches that never were monastic, and the roodscreen further west, the latter a solid wall, normally in the western arch of the crossing, with an altar against it, and a doorway on either side or end of the altar. This is the case now at St. Albans, where the quire-screen or pulpitum is gone, as is the roodscreen in most monastic churches. Indeed, there is not a single church in England where both pulpitum and roodscreen remain. The roodscreen sometimes had a loft and was called a pulpitum, but we should avoid much confusion if, where there were two screens, we always spoke of the eastern one as the pulpitum or quire-screen, and the western one as the roodscreen, for the former did not carry

the rood, while the latter did. In parish churches, where both are blended in one, it would be better usually to speak of the chancel-screen, always remembering that in respect of its loft it was pulpitum as well as roodscreen. Westminster Abbey Church is planned with a short quire and a long nave; the ritual quire is wholly in the nave, and is entered through the pulpitum almost half-way between the crossing and the west door. The roodscreen, which has been swept away, was two bays to the west of it. The arrangement of Cistercian churches, such as Fountains and Kirkstall, was similar, but the ritual quire was partly in the crossing, so as to give more room at the west end of the nave for the *convert* or lay brothers. At Westminster the whole of the space east of the nave was left open for coronations, etc.

From the survey of Mr. Francis Bond's book that we have now made, in which, however, many matters of great importance have not even been referred to, some idea may be formed of the nature of its contents. It is *totus, teres, atque rotundus*, if we may apply all these terms to a book. It deals with the whole subject in a symmetrical and all-round fashion, and is thoroughly satisfactory and worthy of the high commendation that we have already ventured to bestow upon it. We now come to the more recent work (only more recent, however, by some months, or a year at the most), which is much larger, and contains 448 quarto pages, while Mr. Francis Bond's extends only to 192 pages, being, indeed, a handy octavo.

Mr. Bligh Bond starts with the Jewish Tabernacle, but expresses himself, no doubt unintentionally, as if the Tabernacle and the Synagogue were the same thing. Our quire offices may with probability be traced to the Synagogue, but the altar arrangements and screens of the Christian Church correspond, not to those of the Synagogue, but to those of the Tabernacle and of the Temples that succeeded it, and that not by way of survival, but rather of revival. In this book the Christian illustrations begin with a wall-painting believed to be of the fourth century, representing the deacons drawing the veils aside as the celebrant enters

the sanctuary. These veils run on a curtain rod by means of rings. Other examples shew veils connected with colonnaded screens. And it is pointed out that the Armenian Church, and probably also the Abyssinian, retains the ritual use of the altar-veil to this day. The veil in the form of a simple curtain, it is suggested, came first, and then, by degrees, regular screen work, first to support it and afterwards to take its place. The use of the altar-veil became restricted later on, according to this view, to the season of Lent, and so came to be called the Lenten veil. But as there were, according to Durandus, three veils, it does not appear at all certain that the sanctuary veil and the Lenten veil were the same thing. Mr. Bligh Bond agrees with his namesake in thinking that the first sanctuary screens were colonnades with a beam at the top, from which the veils were hung. Mr. Francis Bond mentions the hanging of 'curtains' among the uses of the rood-beam, so that both writers are substantially agreed as to facts, although the one attributes more importance to the beam as the origin of our screens, the other to the veil.

As early as the fourth century, *cancelli* or lattices with corresponding gates took the place of the veil, whence our word 'chancel.' These would be of wood at first, but metal or perforated marble soon came into this use, and such *cancelli* developed into magnificent screens. Metal *cancelli* continued in Italy throughout the mediaeval period. Spain and the Low Countries still retain splendid examples, the latter notwithstanding the Protestant occupation of the churches. In England wood or, rarely, stone, as we have seen, has formed the material of our screens, though in the revival of screens in our own time some have been made of wrought-iron and other metal work. In the book now under consideration, after the discussion as to the 'origins' of roodscreens, come several sections on the planning of churches and the development of screens, in the reading of which one is greatly hindered by the frequent insertion of plates that have nothing to do with the text. Indeed, this is an unfortunate mistake in arrangement that runs through the whole of these volumes. The plates,

always admirable in themselves, ought to have been in a separate volume, where they could have been referred to at once, and would not have been constantly pulling up the reader in his perusal of the printed pages. As it is, we find the plates when we do not want them, and when we do want any plate, we have to turn over a number of leaves until we find it, or else to look it up in the index, for where a plate is referred to in the text its number only is given, not the page at which it is to be found. In Mr. Francis Bond's book all the plates are printed on the pages, the larger ones on a whole page, so that all that is necessary is a reference like 'Barningham (53),' which means that at page fifty-three we may find the illustration of Barningham at once.

When we leave theories and come to facts, both works necessarily cover much of the same ground and often illustrate the same subject. Most of the plates are photographic in both, but not all of them. The advantage of the photographic method is seen in the case of Stanton Harcourt, where there are some remarkable holes cut through the lower part of the screen: these are shewn in the collotype in the one book, but not in the architectural drawing in the other. Mr. Bligh Bond has, by the way, a very interesting appendix on 'Apertures in the Panels of Screens.' These little openings are found at about fifty places, a list of which is given. They are afterthoughts, often quite rudely cut, as they might have been by any one who was not a skilled workman. They are too low down for confessions to have been heard through them, and, moreover, they occur not only singly, but in clusters. They probably served as squints, enabling children to see through into the chancel. A picture of one may be seen in Plate viii (p. 32) of Mr. Bligh Bond's first volume, a plate which contains also a beautiful illustration of the matchless early screen in St. Mary's Hospital, Chichester. Indeed, in both works the illustrations are a very strong point. Often they are simply magnificent, and the quarto pages of Mr. Bligh Bond's book admit of larger scale. His 'diagram sheets' are most interesting; thus sheet 'A' shews triple chancel arches in

six little diagrams, in order of time, from early Reculver to later Stebbing, but they would have been better still with approximate dates to them. Sheet 'B' shews triple arches, the centre one lofty and usually wider than the other two, which rise not from the floor but four or five feet above it like window openings, or large 'squints,' on either side. Sheet 'C' shews the lateral openings still smaller, and constructed with reference to side-altars placed under them. In sheet 'D' the central arch is still larger in proportion, and the side arches are either walled up to form recesses, or have originally been constructed as such, with altars in front of them. These diagrams make no pretence to artistic merit, but we look for it in the reproductions of pen-and-ink drawings with which the pages of the quarto volumes are profusely illustrated. These, however, are coarsely executed and very inferior to the woodcuts that we had in pre-photographic times, though much less costly than woodcuts, and most interesting if nothing else. Wood-engraving is fast becoming, if it has not already become, like copperplate engraving, one of the lost arts, and we need not expect any more to see such woodcuts as there are in Parker's 'Rickman,' or such copperplate engravings as we find in Billings' *Durham*. As to the illustrations in Dom Bede Camm's most valuable account of paintings on screens, we can only say that while their iconographic interest is very great, they are scarcely to be commended as works of art. The execution is coarse, they are wanting in mediaeval feeling, and they make a poor show beside the superb collotypes in the same volumes. But the circumstances of their production are explained in the note on p. 253, and we most heartily welcome them as an invaluable series of rough representations of saints with their attributes, to be studied, as they are meant to be, in connexion with the verbal descriptions.

Profusely as both works are illustrated, a very few more plates or woodcuts might well have been given. Both mention the earliest screenwork of wood that we possess, that at Compton in Surrey, but neither gives an illustration of it. 'The most ancient ambo now surviving,' according

to Mr. Bligh Bond (p. 76), also seems to call for the same advantage.

Comparing now the two books before us, we should say once more that Mr. Francis Bond's octavo fairly and evenly covers the ground indicated in its title. It is, indeed, a most valuable, well arranged, and altogether delightful volume, worthy of the author of *Gothic Architecture*, of *Fonts and Font Covers*, and of *Westminster Abbey*. The two noble quartos of Mr. Bligh Bond and Dom Bede Camm are by no means the same thing on a larger scale. We have seen that, like his namesake, the former writer begins with sections on the general subject, on which he treats in great detail, from supposed pre-Christian origins to the increasing appreciation of the chancel-screen in our own time. The nature of his work admits of the inclusion of a great deal of historical matter, with reference to many points of great interest. This material constitutes Part I, including just over one-quarter of the entire work, and it might perhaps with advantage, together with some other matter of a general nature now at the end of Vol. II, have been published quite separately. For this first part Mr. Bligh Bond alone is responsible, and he says in the Preface that his views of the origin of screenwork are not in all cases those held by his colleague, Dom Bede Camm. Part II is a description of the screenwork in Somerset, arranged under parishes in alphabetical order. Part III is the treatise of Dom [1] Bede Camm on the figures painted on the Devonshire screens, consisting of nearly seventy pages of hagiology and iconography of great and permanent interest. Part IV is on 'Screenwork in Devon,' Part V on the same in Cornwall, and Part VI is a list of upwards of 2000 examples of screenwork in England and Wales, which, as has been pointed out elsewhere, might have been both more complete and more correct. Modern screens are not always distinguished from ancient ones. The Durham list is particularly defective and inaccurate. It actually includes a 'painted screen' at Finchale, where there has never been any church save the ruined Priory church.

[1] In the mediaeval Church of England he would have been 'Dan.'

In the Somerset, Devon, and Cornwall portions we have a noble work for those counties, but it should not have been issued under a general title. The best thing that could be done now would be to bring out the East Anglian and other screens in a uniform volume or volumes: then the whole work would possess a character of completeness. It is unfortunate that these were not included in the plan previous to publication, or that the work was not announced as being on 'the screens of the three Western Counties,' with or without the general introduction.

The amount of sacrilege and destruction revealed in these pages is something appalling, and much of it occurred in the nineteenth century. In one place a rector made a clean sweep of one of the finest screens in the county, and had portions of it made into an overmantel and sideboard. Many screens and lofts disappeared in the disastrous 'restorations' of 'the 'Forties,' and later. Others were cleared away on 'Evangelical' grounds, the screens being thought to deaden the voice of the preacher, and to emphasize the importance of the chancel; in one case at least some of the carved work thereof found its way into the framework of the cottagers' pigsties. In Appendix E to Devon[1] is a list of seventy-seven places in that county alone where screens have been removed; seventy-one in the nineteenth century, six earlier. Both Reformers and Puritans appear to have tolerated screens, as a rule, but not the figures placed on the top of them; at any rate the screens were suffered to remain in the Western and Eastern Counties.

We can only refer very briefly to a few other points of great interest, some of which have been mentioned above, as for example that the roodloft was in a number of cases retained as a singers' or minstrels' gallery in parish churches until modern times. The fine loft at Chedzoy was transposed to form a western gallery in 1841, and many others in the same way at various times, and then swept away in nineteenth-century 'restorations.' The very fine loft at Flamborough, after a sojourn of about forty-five years

[1] P. 284.

at the west end of the church, has lately been restored to its original position over the screen, which has been most carefully repaired under the direction of Mr. C. Hodgson Fowler. It is curious enough, as we have noted above, that the west gallery with the village band is the lineal descendant of the roodloft [1] and that a revival of its use as a singing-gallery is now being advocated by some. The tympana that often occupied the space above the roodloft and within the chancel arch are hardly likely to be revived, yet once they were quite common. With them, only glimpses of the chancel could be obtained from the nave; but there was the element of 'mystery,' as in the primitive use of veils. They were painted with representations of the Doom or other subjects, and, in post-Reformation times, with 'Time and Death,' 'Moses and Aaron,' the Commandments, the Royal Arms, painting representing drapery of curtains, etc. Sometimes, as at Winterton in Lincolnshire, there are holes or grooves for boarding in the soffit of the chancel arch, which have apparently served for the fixing of a tympanum. In this same church three of the stone brackets for the support of the roodloft still remain, one having been hacked away in the eighteenth century to make room for a pulpit. This must have been a very early roodloft, as the brackets are clearly of the same date as the early thirteenth-century chancel arch, and the tympanum would probably be made at the same time.[2]

From the subject of tympana Mr. Bligh Bond passes on to post-Reformation screenwork, a most interesting subject, here very fully treated. At the Reformation the rood and its attendant images were condemned as superstitious, and removed; many lofts and some screens were taken down at the same time, but many were left. For preaching, the loft was usually superseded by a separate pulpit, but in many places it continued to be used as a singers' and

[1] In Lincolnshire and probably elsewhere the singing-gallery was commonly called the 'loft,' so long as it remained.

[2] When the fine modern screen mentioned above, p. 95, was placed here, it was felt that it would savour of unreality to make a new loft, which was not likely to be used.

minstrels' gallery, even down to the Victorian era.[1] But in place of the rood and images the Royal Arms, with their supporters the lion and the Tudor greyhound, now appeared. And so Dr. Martyn, Chancellor to Gardiner, flung at Cranmer these reproachful words, 'Downe with the arms of Christ, and up with a lion and a dog.' Under Mary new roods and images were set up, and we are told that the carvers did a brisk business. In the Visitation articles of Bishop Bonner and of Cardinal Pole it was inquired whether the rood and images were in the churches. Elizabeth's own sympathies would have led to the maintenance of roods, lights, vestments, etc., but the reaction from the persecutions of Mary's reign, and the militant Protestantism of the returned exiles coming from abroad, gained such a hold on the people of England that it was impossible to maintain Catholic order in practice, though the Ornaments Rubric provided for it. In the third year of Elizabeth there was an order for the taking down of roodlofts to the top of the vaults, *i.e.* the coving at the top of the screen, and the setting of some convenient cresting on the side next to the church. Any parish might provide a new screen of joiner's work if so minded; there was always to be a comely partition between the chancel and the church, and where no partition was standing, one was to be supplied. So that there was no objection to screens, only to lofts. But there was considerable difficulty in enforcing these orders; hence the number of lofts remaining to this day. The retention of screens throws much light on the words of the Elizabethan rubric and of our present rubric, 'and the chancels shall remain as they have done in times past,' that is, *inter alia*, screened off. And in many cases tympana were preserved or even new ones made, but the old pictures on them were destroyed or painted over with such subjects as have been named above.[2] The tympanum afforded a convenient space for the exhibition of the Ten Commandments; the later custom of setting them up at the east end of the chancel, where the congregation could not see to read them, came in as the screens and tympana disappeared. Old

[1] See above, p. 98. [2] P. 105.

Gothic forms survived for long after the Reformation, as in the stall canopies and font canopies in Durham Cathedral and the screens at Brancepeth and Sedgefield, which are of the second half of the seventeenth century. In the time of Elizabeth Renaissance screens began to come in, and in the two following reigns screens and stalls were erected in far greater numbers. They were an expression of that revival of Catholic feeling which arose after the Protestant and unsettled days of Elizabeth. The finest of all the Renaissance screens is the noble example at Croscombe in Somerset. At Wimborne and at Ditcheat were very fine Jacobean screens, both of which have been ruthlessly swept away in modern times. Many other examples are mentioned. In 1644 an ordinance was issued for the taking away of all organs, *roods*, and fonts, which seems as if there were some roods remaining even then. Yet although organs and fonts were very often destroyed, screens were usually suffered to remain, and lofts as well, though probably none were erected. With the restoration of the Church and Monarchy screens again came in, a notable example being the magnificent organ screen erected by Bishop Cosin in Durham Cathedral, and swept away in 'the 'Forties.' It is remarkable that this screen was wholly Renaissance in character, while the stalls of the same period were Gothic with a few Renaissance details; these have happily been preserved through two 'Restorations,' though the return-stalls have been put in a line with the others. Even in the eighteenth century the old High Church school never died out, and a few churches were fitted with screens of that date, or with chancel gates extending across the arch. Some were made even in the earlier years of the nineteenth century.

We may mention an interesting example. At Liversedge in Yorkshire a new church was built by the Rev. Hamond Roberson in 1812–13. It was a fair example of the Gothic of that date, and it had, from the first, a lofty chancel-screen of painted wood, with plain pointed arches and folding gates, also a strangely designed wood credence-table. We speak in the past tense, because later on new

tracery was put into the windows, the screen was enriched by cuspings and other ornamental details, and the credence-table of 1813 was discarded.

The Catholic revival in the early Tractarian days naturally led to the adoption of the proper *Ornamenta* of the church, while the simultaneous architectural reformation resulted in screens of great beauty and artistic merit. Amongst the earliest of these were the screens of St. Paul's, Brighton, and of St. Barnabas', Pimlico. These were surmounted by ornamented crosses, as modern screens frequently are. The rood and figures have, however, been introduced in a number of cases.

Before leaving the subject of screens, it may be well to say a few words about the altar-rails. It has been abundantly shewn by Dr. Cox and Mr. Harvey [1] that it is quite a mistake to credit Archbishop Laud with the invention and introduction of altar-rails. The fact is that where screens had been taken away, the need for altar-rails at once arose, not only in England but abroad, and they were in general use in this country in early post-Reformation days, except where Puritan irreverence prevailed. What Laud did was to insist on rails in all cases, and many handsome Laudian and later rails survived until nineteenth-century 'restorers' turned them out for vastly inferior oak or brass rails supported on iron standards, painted chocolate and blue, to be superseded in a few years by decent oak rails and supports of Gothic design. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the rails were sometimes placed round three sides of the altar instead of across from north to south, as they were directed to be by bishops and archdeacons in Laudian days. When it was usual for people to take their dogs with them to church, there was the more need for altar-rails; then again they helped to maintain the right position of the altar at the east end of the chancel. When Bishop Cosin was a Prebendary of Durham he was accused in 1642 by the Puritans of making an enclosure to divide the altar from the quire. We have no means of knowing exactly what this was, whether a presbytery screen

[1] *Church Furniture* (1907), pp. 17–20.

as at St. David's, or altar-rails, but probably the latter, as other country priests were accused of following the example of 'our new fangled Durhamers.'

Another fitting of the nature of a screen is the altar-screen or reredos when standing free and away from the east wall. These were more common in great churches, such as Westminster, York, Beverley, Selby, Lincoln, and Durham, where there are chapels behind the screen. At Ripon there would be a screen of this kind originally, for previous to a modern 'restoration' the sedilia stood in the second arch from the east, not, as now, in the first. In village churches the altar must have sometimes stood some way to the west of the east wall, for we find recesses for lockers just where they are now hidden by the altar and cannot be got at. In these cases there would be an altar-screen or reredos of some sort.

Such are some of the many points of interest contained in or suggested by the two works under review. The treatise of Dom Bede Camm is to all intents and purposes, as we have noted, a distinct work bound up in Mr. Bligh Bond's second volume. And as we have, so far, barely mentioned it, we must now call more particular attention to it. It is not enough to speak of it, however highly, only in general terms, as above[1]; we must consider it in some detail.

The paintings on screens are found in Devon, Cornwall, and East Anglia; elsewhere only here and there throughout England. Those which remain are what have survived the ravages of Puritan reformers or nineteenth-century 'restorers.' Many have been swept away to save the expense of repairing them, and to 'make a vista.' Mr. Harry Hems stated in 1897 that no less than eighty were known to have been destroyed in Devonshire alone, and our authors have largely extended the list in the course of their researches. In some Victorian 'restorations' the screens have been kept, but the figures repainted, or, what is not quite so bad, covered by modern figures painted on paper, which can perhaps be got off. At Harberton a magnificent screen 'has been smothered in shiny and glaring paint,

[1] P. 103.

and the old figures on the panels have been deliberately obliterated and covered with new paintings of the Sunday-at-Home type.' Most of the screens have long been robbed of their lofts, on which would be painted figures similar to those on the panels below. There is abundant evidence in old account-books of the way in which the parishioners gave of their substance towards these screens and their decoration in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and it is pathetic to think how many of these glorious structures were but just completed when the Great Pillage came and the axes and hammers were set to the work of destruction, often before the very eyes of the good people who had provided the screens. Can we be surprised at the insurrection in Devon and Cornwall in 1549? It appears that the Devon paintings in point of artistic merit are inferior to those of East Anglia, which will, let us hope, be described by Dom Bede Camm at some future time. The paintings are as a rule on the west side of the panels only, but at Ashton there is on the east side a very fine set of eight half-figures of prophets bearing scrolls with their prophecies of Christ and other inscriptions. The faces are believed to be portraits of eight sons of a local family. The west side has also a very fine series of saints on its panels. The earliest screen paintings are of the middle of the fourteenth century, but by far the greater number are late fifteenth and early sixteenth. The earliest are on a fragment of a screen found in a ruined chapel at Whitford, representing the Blessed Virgin, our Lord, a king, and a bishop; the latest are some grotesque Italian designs with cherubs, monsters, etc., of fully developed Renaissance character. The largest and most beautiful series of painted panels in the county is at Plymtree, where there are no less than thirty-four saints in all. Six of the original panels have disappeared, and others have been substituted, in a different style, and painted by a ruder hand. All the thirty-four are described, and many of them figured. We think that the reason for the special emblem of any saint, if known, should be given in all cases, and not in some only. We shall try to supply the omission in any to which we refer in which the reason is not given,

and will now notice a few out of the whole series that seem to call for special attention either on account of the representations of the saint being very uncommon, or of something unusual in the mode of treatment. St. James the Greater usually has the scallop shell on his hat, in allusion to pilgrims bringing these shells from the shore at Compostella, where the saint's famous shrine was. But it does not appear in the figure. Probably some traces of it might be found on the painting, if carefully looked for. Four panels represent the Adoration of the Magi. The late Rev. Thomas Mozley, sometime Rector of Plymtree, published an illustrated monograph in which he tried to make out that the three figures of the Magi are portraits of Henry VII, Prince Arthur, and Cardinal Morton. But Mr. Mozley, however learned and ingenious, had not studied archaeology enough to understand how easily such conjectures may be wholly wide of the mark. But the arguments he adduces are quite inadequate for proof. The dress of the 'Cardinal' is a difficulty; the thurible held by the 'Prince' may or *may not* be the 'tun' marked with an M—Morton's *rebus*—it is certainly not unique. And the 'King' might be Henry VI. As no *portrait* of Morton is known it would be worth while to look for the history of the screen in that of local families. Who put it there, and when? Strange mistakes, it appears, have been made in lists of saints hung up in Devonshire churches to explain the screen paintings. St. John the Baptist, though clad in a camel's skin with the head dangling between his bare legs (as often elsewhere) is put down as 'St. Agnes, V.M.' because he carries the Lamb; St. Bavon, with a falcon on his fist, is called 'Our Saviour in the act of Benediction.' A set of alternate prophets and apostles has been said to represent phases of the quarrel between Henry II and St. Thomas of Canterbury. Henry VI, who was nearly being canonized, is put down as Richard II, and St. Barbara as St. Philip the Apostle! To return to the right descriptions. 'An unknown clerk' is represented as an elderly man with a long beard, in a surplice shewing a little of the cassock, and a round cap, nimbed, holding the two cruets and the lavabo towel. He

is represented as a parish clerk, but the nimbus is puzzling, and there is no known saint with whom he can be identified. St. Sitha or Osyth is represented with her big bunch of keys on a large ring. She was a holy woman of Lucca who kept house for her master, 'a perfect compound of Martha and Mary,' hence the keys. And she was invoked by good wives who had lost their keys, as Sir Thomas More says, 'St. Sythe women get to seke their keys.' St. Sidwell or Sativola, a virgin martyr of Exeter, was beheaded, and is represented, like St. Denys, with her severed head in her hands, and a scythe, the instrument of her martyrdom, resting under one arm. She is said [1] to be represented in one of the windows of All Souls College, Oxford, but we think that we remember her in the ante-chapel of New College.

Such are some of the most remarkable of the figures at Plymtree. In six Devon churches the Apostles with the articles of the creed under them alternate with the Prophets and their prophecies, but the arrangement and inscriptions are not quite the same in all cases. The Sibyls, with their attributes, are found on several screens. They were supposed to have been inspired in pagan times to predict the coming of Christ. Hence the line in the *Dies irae* in its oldest form:

'Teste David cum Sibylla,'

later altered to

'Teste Petro cum Sibylla,'

or, from the unwillingness to admit the Sibyl as a witness to Christian truth,

'Crucis expandens vexilla.'

But when the screens were painted, the Sibylline verses were commonly accepted as genuine, and so in iconography their Sibyls came to rank with Apostles and Prophets. Their predictions are referred in other hymns and sequences besides the *Dies irae*, and in the Holy Week processions at Seville they form prominent figures. They are commonly represented in art as women in fantastic costumes, bearing

[1] P. 228.

emblems referring to their 'prophecies.' At Bradninch they are as follows: (1) *Samia*, a crib or cradle, for the Nativity; (2) *Erythraea*, a red rose; (3) *Persica*, a lantern; (4) *Europa*, a sword; (5) *Agrippa*, a scourge; (6) *Tiburtina*, a hand; (7) *Libyca*, an ewer and basin; (8) *Hellespontia* (?), a cross; (9) *Cumana*, a sponge; (10) *Cimmeria* (?), pincers and nails; (11) *Delphica*, a horn; (12) *Phrygia*, a cross and banner, for the Resurrection. Numbers 3 to 10 are Passion emblems. The emblems borne by the Sibyls are not always quite the same. *Erythraea* sometimes has a white rose.[1] In Devonshire *Libyca* sometimes occurs with the pillar for the scourging, *Delphica* with the crown of thorns, *Hellespontia* with a trident (perhaps for the sponge), as well as the crown of thorns, and so on. As *Delphica* prophesied of the Nativity as well as of the Passion, the horn may be a *biberon* or feeding-bottle, which is sometimes actually shewn with *Cimmeria*, who, according to one version, prophesied thus of the nursing,

> 'Quedam pulcra facie prolixa capillis sedens super sede nutrit puerum dans ei lac proprium.'

which will be seen not to scan, as it stands. As to an emblem, the precise suitability does not matter so long as it suggests the idea intended. Other sets of figures found on screens are the Four Evangelists, the Four Western Doctors, and the Mysteries of our Lord and of our Lady. The Evangelists and Doctors go well on the two doors, four on each. At Alphington are some very curious figures, one supposed to be a Carmelite saint; another—St. Dunstan seizing the Devil by the nose with pincers; another—St. Denys carrying his mitred head, and with a nimbus over the neck; and another, of 'Sir John Schorne, gentleman born, who conjured the Devil into a boot.' He occurs at two other places in Devon and at six in Norfolk. At Alphington he holds a long boot in his left hand, with the prisoner peering out at the top. At Hennock and at

[1] There is a very complete list in the Appendix to Husenbeth's *Emblems of Saints* (1882), p. 408.

Portlemouth is St. Peter the Dominican Martyr of Verona, 1252 A.D.; he received two cuts on the head with an axe, and is represented with a falchion across the top of his head, or in his hand. At Kenton, St. Cecilia does not hold an organ, as she usually does, but something like a guitar. At Portlemouth there are, besides Sir John Schorne, some rare saints. One, supposed to be St. Onolaus, in whose honour the church was dedicated, holds a church; St. Cornelius appears as a Pope holding a horn of unction and a triple cross; another, not identified, holds a crucifix; St. Catherine of Siena wears a crown of thorns and has a heart in her right hand and a book in her left, in allusion to her having received a crown of thorns from our Lord, and His sacred heart in exchange for her own; several figures formerly here have been lost at a 'restoration.' At Tor Brian is a most curious figure of St. Victor of Marseilles, martyred 304 A.D., representing him in armour, holding a sword in his right hand and a windmill in his left. The windmill appears elsewhere. In the legend of his martyrdom it is said that while the executioners were trying to crush him in a *handmill*, the machinery broke down, and then he was beheaded. There is also a strange figure of a priest in a chasuble holding a long-tailed quadruped by a chain; it is supposed to represent the Breton St. Armil, who vanquished a dragon, and to explain a mysterious image in Henry VII's Chapel, which probably represents St. Armil of Ploermel, who was regarded by Henry VII as one of his patrons. Other uncommon saints found in Devon are St. Bridget of Sweden, with the Holy Dove, writing on a scroll, or holding the book of her revelations; St. William of York, as an archbishop holding his cross; and St. Alexis, who lived and died under a staircase, represented as holding a long ladder. There is a figure at Wolborough with two daggers, doubtfully attributed to St. Olave. It is said that the popularity of St. Olave does not seem to have long survived the Danish period. There is, however, a representation of him on the roodscreen at Barton Turf in Norfolk, and at St. Cuthbert's College, Ushaw, is a mediaeval cope with figures of saints, one a crowned king holding a ship, and the

inscription 'S. tulius,' which puzzled the good people there until it was pointed out that 'tulius' is a Latin form of Tooley, which survives in Tooley Street, London, named from St. Olave's Church. So Tawdry for St. Audrey, Tandra for St. Andrew, Tedan for St. Aidan, Tantony for St. Anthony, Tobin for St. Aubin, and other like forms.

We have now instanced some of the most remarkable examples in the body of Dom Bede Camm's work. This is followed by an alphabetical list of saints, etc., with names of churches where found, illustrated by about fifty representations of panels, most of which are as curious as those already referred to. We must not occupy any more space by referring to these in detail. But a perusal of this list will be found to be no less interesting than that of the previous pages. The Twelve Apostles are the most frequently represented. Five of them are found in twenty places, the rest in one to six fewer, owing to some figures being lost out of sets. St. Matthew is recorded for only fourteen places, whether as Apostle or as Evangelist; St. John for twenty-six, as both; St. Mark and St. Luke for five each, as Evangelists. St. John the Baptist appears at thirteen places, St. Paul at fourteen, St. Stephen at twelve, St. Lawrence at ten, St. Vincent at one only. St. Apollonia, invoked for toothache, was very popular, and is found at fourteen places. Sir Thomas More says, 'Saincte Apoline we make a tooth-drawer, and may speke to her of nothing but sore teeth.' The Homily 'Against Peril of Idolatry and superfluous Decking of churches,' says, 'All diseases have their special Saints, as gods, the curers of them—the toothache, St. Appoline, etc.' Barnabe Googe says:

'Saint Appolin the rotten teeth doth helpe when sore they ache.'

The origin of it all was that her teeth were beaten out at the time of her martyrdom, 249 A.D., and so she might well be expected to sympathize with all who had 'sore teeth.' She is represented as holding a tooth in a pair of pincers. St. Sidwell appears nine times, St. George six, the Sibyls five, St. Sithe four, Sir John Schorne three times, but St.

Christopher only once, the reason being, no doubt, that there was always a figure of him in every church, it being supposed that by gazing at his likeness one might be preserved for the rest of the day from any evil death. For a similar reason our Lady never appears on a screen panel except as one of a group ; there would always be at least one separate representation of her in some other part of the church.

We might note or comment upon many other points in the three works that have now come under our review, but our space is exhausted. We trust that what we have said will help to promote a real interest in the screens and lofts that are still left to us, and even in remaining portions of these, and that a more general knowledge of what these *ornamenta* were and ought to be, will lead to a more extensive adoption of them in the ancient churches that have lost them, as well as in our modern churches, which cannot rightly be regarded as complete without them. We need hardly say that we are by no means advocating a return to representations arising out of such doubtful and puerile legends as many of those to which we have referred. All our ecclesiastical art should be real, and based upon the beliefs current in the Church at the present time. Architectural design of the first class is for all time : we shall never devise any screens better than those of the fifteenth century, therefore our wisest course is to follow, for Gothic churches at any rate, on the same lines. And as to iconographic decoration, it is perhaps best let alone, so far as screens are concerned. It is not of their essence. A good oak screen looks exceedingly well, and always will, and that without any colour or gilding whatever. But we must not now go further into the subject of modern church furniture. It only remains once more to say how deeply indebted the Church should be to those who have done so much, and that so well, to illustrate the noble works that her children wrought in the days that are past.

Art. V.—HOW WE MAY 'THINK OF THE TRINITY.'

1. *Personality, Human and Divine.* Being the Bampton Lectures for the year 1894. By J. R. Illingworth, M.A. (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd. 1894.)
2. *Divine Immanence: an Essay on the Spiritual Significance of Matter.* By the same. (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd. 1898.)
3. *The Doctrine of the Trinity Apologetically considered.* By the same. (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd. 1907.)

And other Works.

The three works named above stand in intimate relation to each other, not only as the worthy productions of an eminent theologian, but also because the subjects dealt with are themselves related not merely by the mode of treatment, but because no one of them can be thoroughly studied without attention being given to the others. So intimately connected are Divine Personality, the Holy Trinity, and the immanence of the Deity in His works and His transcendence over them, that accuracy of thought on any one will illuminate the others, and the true significance of each is only reached in a harmonious conception of the whole. Central and fundamental is the Holy Trinity, which is the subject to which our attention will be chiefly directed. With a God-given instinct the Church has realized that the truth of the Trinity is of primary significance. It is so, not only in regard to theological thought but also in relation to the religious and moral life; and, if we are not mistaken, it is soon about to become an aid to the solution of many problems of modern times which the fuller science of Nature and of Man is pressing upon our attention.

After we have formulated our thought into a definite statement of a doctrine as a truth, there is, very frequently, if not in every case, a much more difficult mental work to be attempted, if not always successfully; namely, to 'think

back' (*nachdenken*) to the actuality of which the doctrine is the symbol or indicator. After we are convinced of the truth and reasonableness of the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Trinity, there remains the difficult, and perhaps impossible, task of thinking of the Trinity itself—of God in His tri-personality as One; so that our concept shall be in perfect accord with that which is indicated in the doctrine. The distinction attempted to be drawn, and also the difficulty of advancing to the further stage of thought, may be illustrated by a reference to the law of gravitation. Most people can form a correct idea of what is meant by the law of attraction according to mass; but how many, or rather how few, there are who can think of the attraction as it is in itself. It may be said, that there is always a 'mystery' beyond our thinking (which is not disputed), and that the Holy Trinity is itself a 'mystery,' and so beyond our thinking in a clear concept, or even in several connected concepts. That may be true; and is no doubt so far true that there must always be something beyond our thought, or rather beyond our present capacity of thinking. It may be observed, however, that properly speaking a 'mystery' (*μυστήριον*) is something which has been revealed, and is, therefore, presented to thought; and, moreover, that when we have been able to formulate a doctrine, it is desirable that we think out the content of the doctrine to its logical conclusions. Doctrines are of chief value as they enable us to see facts; and one of the most useful purposes of logical thinking is, that it furnishes a ladder by which we ascend to the point of sight. It is this point of sight with reference to the Holy Trinity that we seek to attain: How we may 'think of the Trinity' itself. A statement and illustration of the resultant concept in one mind, even if it should not prove itself satisfactory to other minds, may direct attention to a method of thinking by which better results may hereafter be reached.

The terminology employed in the discussion of such a subject as the Trinity adds not a little to our difficulty, because terms are of necessity variable in value—not only changing in the course of the ages of varying thought, but

also necessarily bearing a varying signification to different minds. Blake has said, 'A fool sees not the same tree that a wise man sees'; and words connote different things to different minds, even when best defined. Terms are like what a currency would be which changed from gold to silver, or copper, or even lead, in the hands of the users. The terms 'Person,' 'Personality,' 'Consciousness,' and 'Immanence' are instances. It is open to question whether it is possible for us to see in the designation 'the devil' just that which Jesus Christ saw in it. Without, however, giving laboured definitions, it is hoped that ambiguity will be avoided and the sense of the terms made apprehensible.

The Catholic doctrine of the Trinity has at its foundation the idea that the differentiated Personality of the Godhead is self-contained; is not limited to the phenomenal, as in Sabellianism; is not an evolution within the Deity, being an adaptation of Himself to the circumstances arising out of His creation of a universe; nor is it merely a mode of apprehending Him, imposed by necessity upon creature thought. The Trinity, or the Fact which we express in that term, is essential to the Divine Being. This may be placed in contrast with all those systems of thought concerning the Deity which, while correct in abstracting all relativity, leave an Absolute so devoid of any attributable characteristics as to be like, if not identical with, the super-existent or non-existent Deity of Basilides—'The God that is not' (*ὁ οὐκ ὢν θεός*). The philosophic impulse to discover unity is at times confused with a demand for simplicity as the ultimate of thought. Oneness is not incompatible with complexity. The atom, even, is found to be a complexity which passes beyond conception; and both in the physical and psychic orders of life the higher the being the greater the complexity. And this is more marked in the spiritual order than in the material, as witness the human mind. The Kantian division of the mind into cognition, feeling, conation—which is only a general outline—gives an instance of a complexity in what is itself a perfect oneness; which suggests that it is the nature of spirit to possess a greater complexity than anything in

the physical order, and that in it the oneness is more marked. Arising out of the fact mentioned above—that the higher the being the greater is the complexity—comes the idea that the Deity in Himself is as the Highest characterized by what is most remote from simplicity, and is the most complex. This lends assistance to thinking of the Trinity; but does it not launch us upon the confusing conception that the Deity may have personalities without limit? We shall see, as we proceed, that the doctrine of a tri-personality is the more reasonable conception.

The manifoldness within the Godhead suggests the question of the capacity of the human mind to form a concept according to the Fact. It is not only a characteristic of spirit to possess complexity, but this very characteristic endows it with a capacity for apprehending it in thought. It is not necessary to enter into a lengthy discussion of the question, dealt with by Sir William Hamilton and others, as to the number of things to which the mind can give simultaneous attention, since it is certain that a multitude of matters may enter into the region of consciousness which do not receive the concentration which is the factor in attention. On the soul-side of spirit the complexity in the perception of an extended landscape, or in the simultaneous unification of its elements in the mind's concept, is very intricate. A musical conductor of choir and orchestra informed the writer that he hears simultaneously every element in the performance. We might say, that his mind gathered the parts into a simultaneous concept as a whole. Put either way, there is a great power of thinking of the manifold in unity. And, from a study of the spirit of man when it is least limited by physical circumstance, it seems a fair inference to say, that it has the capacity of receiving in thought the complexity of the Deity as a harmonious, though not exhaustive, whole. Our thinking of each other which is personal knowledge is not in successive bits, but in a manifold concept; and the apprehension of the Trinity is of the same kind, though the Fact is greater.

That we believe that there are three Persons in the

Godhead requires that we have a clear notion of what constitutes 'personality' or a 'person.' It will be admitted by us that consciousness is the fundamental and necessary characteristic of personality; but it will be helpful to look attentively at this point. That it is needful to do so will be seen, if we bear in mind that, according to the doctrine of the Trinity, the Deity is not a personality but three personalities. It may be said that He possesses personality; but it is not strictly true to say He is *a* Person, since He is *three* Persons in one God. Confusion and contradiction are introduced, if we try to think of a Personality which is also three Persons.

There are many varieties of personality as there are many varieties of form; but as all kinds of form have something in common, so every personality has a common characteristic, namely, consciousness. It is not necessary to introduce the notion of 'self-consciousness' as the distinguishing mark of personality; because, if consciousness be rightly understood, it includes the element intended to be designated by 'self-consciousness'—a sense of the self. Consciousness is the mind's knowledge of its own states, or the sense of its relation to what is not itself. If we take Lotze's doctrine, which is accepted by the writer, that things possess 'soul,' or sensibility within themselves, we have in the atom, for example, a limited kind of consciousness. It may be capable of only two sensibilities—the one that which we should call an attraction, the other a repulsion. In its simple soul-experience, in each of its sensations and by their alternation, there is implied a self conscious of itself as having sensation and a change of states. There may not be here that supposed power of the human personality to be conscious of itself as distinct from its states which is called self-consciousness, and commonly regarded as essential to personality. Indeed, it is doubtful whether the human mind has such a power. The states of the mind, however central and however allied to it in quality, are not itself, because they are objects of knowledge, and as such are not the knowing subject. Another remark seems necessary, namely, that

personality is not necessarily at its highest in 'self-consciousness'; for that self is the most perfect and fulfils its function most perfectly which is most conscious, most fully and accurately conscious, of the not-self.

On the above lines of thought we have personality in the simplest entities, rising higher in the vegetable, higher still in the animal, until it reaches a richer fullness of capacity and content in man. In its last stage it may be allied with other powers, of which there may be no resemblances in its simpler forms, but these additional powers do not alter the essential element of personality—consciousness. They only enrich it. And it is possible to believe, as indeed we do, that there are beings of powers wholly different from ours and vastly greater who are persons, and persons for the simple reason that they are conscious. It is not possible for life to transcend consciousness; and a living God must possess personality.

Lotze lays aside the Trinity as a speculation into which he will not enter;[1] and yet his whole system of thought furnishes confirmation of its reasonableness, and steps to a consistent conception of it. Dr. Illingworth quotes from the *Microcosmus* his statement 'Perfect personality is in God only,' etc.; and to this we may add the following: '*Perfect* personality is reconcilable with the conception of an Infinite Being; for finite beings only an approximation to this is attainable.'[2] This perfection of personality in God is in the perfection of His consciousness, including 'self-consciousness' along with consciousness of the not-self. It is in this perfection of consciousness in God that we find the fact of the Holy Trinity. The perfection of His consciousness gives it that complexity which is most marked, as we have observed, in the Highest Being. In the finite being there is no need for more than one personality; and the unthought-out notions of dual personality and a subliminal self in man are crude conceptions. But it is necessary to the perfection of the Divine Consciousness that it shall be differentiated; and that the differentiation shall be the

[1] *Philosophy of Religion*, p. 149.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 69.

most distinct; so distinct, indeed, that each is a separate Person—a distinct consciousness. By this we are not to understand three self-consciousnesses, but three consciousnesses of that which is the not-self. Three Persons in one God is conceivable thus.

But we must look further into what is meant by three consciousnesses. The content of each consciousness, and also the power of the consciousness itself, must differ. If there were three consciousnesses within the Godhead which were in every respect the same, the contents coinciding in every particular, they would not be distinguishable; indeed, if distinguished, they would not be perfectly coincident. It has been remarked that in human thinking the observance of differences is necessary to true knowledge; and we may therefore expect that in the Highest Consciousness the differences will be most marked. What distinctions of consciousness may we find in the Godhead? It is the statement of this which is the central part of our subject—How we may think of the Trinity.

'There is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost.'

A person is a distinct and separate consciousness. There is one consciousness of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost. The Personality of the Father is a consciousness necessary and peculiar to Himself as Father. It is original, underived, self-existent and perfect. It is a consciousness of a non-Ego, and not simply a self-consciousness; and yet it *is* prior to any creative act or exercise of the Divine will; prior, that is, in the order of being, for time is not. The content of this consciousness is the knowledge of the Father. Like all consciousness, it is the Father's knowledge of the states of His own perfect Mind. These states form a true objectivity; for the states of the mind, even if the product of the mind itself, are not the personal Ego. The contrary notion is a sediment of the Spenserian philosophy. Lotze somewhere shews, or suggests, that what the mind effects is not the mind. The Father's knowledge is, therefore, not the Father, even though it may be original in Him, having its sole source in His Person.

The consciousness of the Father, and the content of it, are not the result of experience ; are not acquired ; and not dependent upon, or affected by, anything outside or subsequent to itself. It is not a knowledge of things, but knowledge existing *before* things and independently of them ; before, in the order of being. It consists of ideas in every sense perfect : perfect in comprehension, including ideas of all things, possible and impossible, infinite and finite, good and evil ; perfect in degree, being as full and accurate as if the things present in idea were existent in fact, and as such were altogether and entirely known. The ideas in themselves have not causative power ; nor do they of themselves possess moral quality. God knows evil without being evil. It is reasonable to believe that it is essential to Deity to have this true omniscience ; and to have it as Idea, distinct and distinguished from Fact. It is thus that we may think of the Person of the Father.

The Personality of the Son is derived, being begotten of the Font of Deity ; and that which constitutes His separate consciousness is contained in the Father in Idea. But before it is in the consciousness of the Son it must be existent as Fact. Knowledge in the Deity would not be perfect, if Fact were not distinctly known as apart from Idea. It is the Son who is, in all respects, God in relation to that which is. He is in the bosom of the Father as knowing all which is, is Fact, in the Father. By, or through Him, all things are made which are made ; and as facts determined upon He is in relation to them from the beginning to the completion of their creation. He is the conscious Expression, Logos, of the Father in effected acts and in presented Idea. His Personality is in its content the Deity in conscious relation to all and every fact, realizing and dealing with it as it is known. And this includes, as the knowledge of the Father does in idea, the knowledge of the finite with its limitations as well as of the infinite. It seems reasonable to hold that there is thus a Personality of the Son ; and that it is necessary as the consciousness of what *is* in distinction from that which *is only in idea.*

When we come to think of the Personality of the Holy

Ghost we are confronted with a more difficult point. The history of the doctrine of the Spirit, both among the Catholics and the Arians, shews this; and it is only necessary to notice modern thought to see how there is a liability to substitute for the Third Person an impersonal influence, or to confuse the Persons from not observing the distinction of the Holy Ghost into a separate Personality. This is partly due to a double sense of the term 'Spirit,' both of which are correct if carefully employed. 'God is Spirit' is applicable to the whole Godhead; but, when it is said that He 'proceedeth from the Father,' the idea of the Spirit is particularized. For the present it will be sufficient to observe that the fundamental concept of spirit is an invisible activity—or an active invisibility. If we add to this the notion of personality—of a consciousness of His own, we have what we express in the doctrine of the Third Person in the Holy Trinity.

The double idea of the Spirit 'proceeding' from the Father and inflowing into the Son, into His creatures and into creation is suggestive of a personal inworking, or rather an inworking Person. The Spirit is the personal operation of God; or the operating personality which is alive in Its, or His, perfect consciousness, being God in operation. It may assist the expression of what is here meant, if we contrast Divine operation with human operation. Man's working is not original and independent. It is dependent upon and assisted by the 'laws' of nature, and is guided to its ends, and its ends are brought about, by that which God has made. In man's case, therefore, he himself cannot and need not consciously go along with his working throughout its stages to the end. But there is no one prior to God, nothing outside Him, to direct the operation and process of things; and nothing can be made to act of itself. He must, so to speak, go consciously along the whole process, or it would not act according to His will; indeed, it would not act at all. The operation of God is that of a living activity, conscious in the operation itself in every step, means, effort, and purpose; and as such a separate consciousness. The more the working of God is studied the more it

will be seen that it is not an impersonal effluence sent forth with mere force and fixed direction. His operation comes into relations with freedom in the creature; and consequently has a corresponding free adaptability to varying conditions, which is wholly inconceivable unless we suppose a Personality of the Deity as the Operation itself.

When we come to consider the oneness of God we must look for it in that which does not confuse, nor blend, nor wholly separate from each other the Three Persons. The differentiation is real so far as a distinction of consciousness is concerned; and this may carry with it differentiations not yet recognizable by us; but within all there is that essential unity which binds as One, not as parts in a whole, but as the Being who is in, and who contains, the three Persons.

It is important to bear in mind that we are thinking of One who is Spirit, very and only Spirit. It is difficult for many minds to grasp the idea of spirit as a true, *the* true, substance and reality when every quality of substance, as it is presented to us in phenomena, has to be set aside. It seems as if nothing were left. It is possible to approach the notion of spirit as substance by the aid of recent science of matter. Anyone who will study such a work as Gustave Le Bon's *Evolution of Matter* will see how the substance of matter and that into which it passes by 'dissociation,' or dissolution, is what is named 'ether'—a substance absolutely devoid of those phenomenal attributes to which it gives its support. Yet there it is; the very substance of all the wonderful variety in the material order. Spirit is even less phenomenal than ether, since it is above space, whereas ether occupies space. Spirit is not form, but makes form; is not in space, but makes space; is in itself non-phenomenal, yet from it come all phenomena. It is life in itself, power in itself, mind in itself and is Being itself. It holds all which it is in unity, since it is indivisible into parts. An image of this unity in the Deity is imaged in the unity of diversities in the spirit of man. The eternal Spirit is the essential substance of the three Persons, and as Spirit contains the threefold Consciousness.

The unity may be realized in the fact of the Eternity of the three Persons. They are co-eternal by what we may be permitted to call simultaneous being. The Son is begotten of, and the Holy Ghost proceedeth from, the Father, in the order of relation, not by time sequence. In a mathematical circle the centre involves circumference and radii: they all come simultaneously. And yet there is a dependence of the parts; the centre makes the radii, and the *defining* of the radii gives the circumference. (There is a suggestiveness in the mathematical circle which may be mentioned in passing. The centre is the Father, who moves outward in the radii as the Holy Ghost; and wherever along its 'proceeding' the radiation is defined in act or idea, is the Son; and the circumference, the Son, is the centre unfolded. The illustration admits of further development.) In the Eternity of the Trinity by what we have called the simultaneousness of the being of the Persons there appears to be involved the idea and fact of essential unity.

A further sign of the unity, arising from the above, is that each Person involves the others; and—were it possible—to take away one would be the end of all. If we may represent in thought only, not as being the fact, that the Persons are parts of the Godhead, the circle illustrates the necessity of the part to the whole. That is unity in its perfection, however complex the whole may be. That there is this necessity of all three Persons to each other may be accounted for, we venture to suggest, in something analogous which is found to run through all being, from top to bottom, so far as we know it. Without entering into particular references in the philosophy of Lotze, it may be stated, that the doctrine of things which will be employed here is based upon his teaching. Everything is three and one. A thing is what it is in itself and to itself, its 'soul,' or self, according to Lotze; it is also what it manifests of itself to other beings; and it is what its influence is upon other things (or rather, what its influence is within other things; for action of things upon things is by their inner states.) Here we have being as self, manifestation, and operation. The higher being advances, the more marked is this differentiation; and

yet, from another point of view, the closer is the unity. There is no being without this unity of differences, so far as we know. And it is a fair inference, that it belongs to being as such, and is most perfect in the One Being of all, who has given an impress of Himself to His works.

There is yet another aspect of unity which presents itself. It is that which is the Life itself; and which is contained in each Person and contains the whole. It has been named the 'Nature' of God. It is that by which we are able to say, 'Such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy Ghost'; the 'qualis,' which is more than the 'quality' of common thought, and yet comprehends that idea. 'God is love'; *is*, not merely having love as a 'quality' of Himself, an attribute. It is in Him Being, His Being: the very and only Substance, in which inheres, if we may so say, all which we seek to express by 'The Godhead.' The 'Qualis,' or Suchness of God—which comprehends what we mean by Divine holiness, goodness, moral perfection, and every other conceivable excellence, is His Life, Himself; and as such is common to each Person of the Trinity. We, as yet, but dimly apprehend the reality of the Spiritual Being; and even that which we see, we may not be able to say, such is the uncertain sense of words.

Immanence is not identity, nor is it likeness; and it does not necessarily involve moral conformity, even admitting of antagonism. This is because Immanence is personality. Immanence of personality while predicating relation with all creation, also requires a full distinction between the Deity and that in which He abides. Immanence has reference to in-working and manifestation: Transcendence to the Deity above and apart from the relation of immanence. As operation the Immanence is an uncompleted process of the Spirit; and so the effected stage is not one with the Person of the Spirit, though it is the work of the Spirit. The manifestation, or Logos, in the Immanence is presented in the result effected by the Spirit; but this, too, is in progress and not final. The Immanence admits of limitations in the processes of working and manifestation which are not in the Transcendence. The above may be applied to the Incarnation; since,

according to our Lord's own teaching, the fullness of operation and the full manifestation are not reached while He is in flesh, though they follow therefrom in the great Parousia.

The Universality of the Godhead is fundamental to Immanence. We may approach this concept through an illustrative mathematical notion—illustrative, not analogous. And if we have to speak of the Deity in the terms of physics—for all metaphysical terms are derived from physics—it is not to be inferred that we attribute to Spirit time or space. Mathematically every point of space is a centre of radii proceeding in every direction, and all along all the radii of all the centres is circumference. These all interlace, circle passing through circle and radii, and radii through radii and circle, until every point in space is at once centre, radius, and circumference. In this the threefoldness of each point is only in relation to other points; but it may help to an expression and conception of the fact that the whole Godhead is in relation to every point and part of the universe. The Trinity is *at* every point equally on account of the Oneness of the Deity; and as Spirit is present in all, though not presented in all. The kind and quality of that in which the Deity is immanent does not affect or vary the fact or degree of the immanence, which is entirely from the nature of the Godhead itself. God is equally immanent in heaven, in earth, and in hell.[1]

As the term itself implies, Immanence is not identity; for He who is in is not that which He is in. Creation is not an extension of the Deity, nor an emanation; but is objective to Himself, being the work of His will freely exercised. The cause, it has been stated, is one with the effect; which may be true of a cause when it is meant to include only that which is used in the effect. But no creation could as an effect exhaust the Deity; and, indeed, could not take from Him even the cause of itself, and therefore could not be identical. It is an essential mark of personality in all its degrees or species to be separate or distinct from the not-self. Personalities cannot mix: each is bounded in itself. A personality

[1] *Cf.* Ps. cxxxix.

may be displaced, or dominated, as in daemoniacal possession; or, where freedom does not exist, as probably in the personality of things, it may be used; but it is still, as personality, a distinct entity. Not only, therefore, does the personality of the Deity distinguish Him from His work; but all His works, from the lowest to the highest, having, as we have stated, personality in their degree, have a boundary which gives them a distinctive entity—their self, or soul.

Immanence does not necessarily involve likeness and moral conformity. It may even admit of antagonism. This point possesses peculiar interest at the present time, owing to the revival of antiquated ideas in what is termed 'The New Theology,' and in allied lines of thought. There is a tendency, or more than a tendency in some quarters, to confuse Immanence with a vague Pantheism which views all expressions of life, even the grossest immorality, as efforts to realize the Divine, or struggles of the Divine to realize itself. A vague conception of what Immanence is may induce the supposition that the Deity is so intimately allied to that which He inhabits that He must be the sole source of the qualities of all forms of life, and that the varieties of moral characteristics are all processes of the Divine working. The manifest moral antagonisms are incompatible with this supposition; and a correct conception of the Immanence excludes it. Immanence brings the Deity into relation with two sets of personalities, which, because they are personalities, are bounded off from Him and He from them; first, things and animals, in which soul-life is mechanical; and, secondly, the higher and free personalities. The energy transferred from the immanent Deity either to mechanical or free personalities is received in their inner states—in their souls. The inner action of the immanent Deity into the mechanical souls will contain His moral nature up to the extent of His activity; but it will not communicate it to the state of the mechanical personality, any more than the murderer who fires a revolver communicates his moral state to the bullet, because such a soul cannot possess a moral quality. And, although the activities of such souls when impelled by Divine direction will express

the character of God, it cannot be said that they always do so unless it can be proved that the Immanence is the only source of their states. Souls are capable of receiving in their inner states other action than the Divine. And there is evidence to be furnished that they do receive such influences —'An enemy hath done this'—though it cannot be given now. And when we come to free personalities the Immanence is related to an element which differentiates them from the others; namely, the freedom. It therefore deals with them, not only as personalities with whom it does not mingle, but also as creatures who may, or may not, accept its moral impress by free determination. But whether such a free soul does or does not appropriate the energy of the Deity, it remains a distinct personality; and it and the Immanence are still separated by the necessary boundary of personality. Personalities cannot mix. How the Godhead can thus be by immanence in such relation to the evil as well as the good, and for what reason, is made manifest in the Incarnation.

As has been already suggested, the Holy Trinity is intimately connected with the immanence and transcendence of the Deity; for the whole Godhead is universally in relation with every particular of the creation. Immanence is the term employed to designate the connexion itself; Transcendence connotes the Deity above and apart from that connexion. The teaching of Plato, that the Idea is immanent in the particular things, introduces the distinction between the transcendent and the immanent. In the *Phaedo* Socrates says: 'I cleave fast in my own mind, that nothing makes an object beautiful except the presence of Ideal Beauty, or their communion with each other, or the advent of the Idea in whatsoever way.' If the way in which we are thinking of the Trinity is correct, the Father is only mediately in relation with the creation; that is, by the Spirit in operation and in the Son in manifestation. But transcendence is not confined to the Person of the Father, since the Persons of the Son and the Spirit transcend that which they are in immanence. Or, to express it somewhat differently, although the Spirit and the Son are

immanent as Persons, the immanence does not use up, so to speak, the whole contents of their Personalities; but, in certain ways, involves limitations of them. The Holy Spirit is immanent as working personality. The working is Spirit; and the idea of localization must be rigorously excluded. Not until we know (which may never be) what spirit-working is, can we come nearer to the truth than the conception, that it is the inner activity of one personality acting directly upon the inner state of other personalities. Such working of the Spirit is of necessity, according to the kind of universe God has elected to create, a process, a succession of stages, of which the prior is absolutely necessary to render a subsequent stage possible. There are no leaps in the Divine working. That, in itself, is limitation in the content of immanence, but not of the immanent Personality. These stages are diverse from each other, and, being diverse stages, no one of them is identical with the Spirit Himself. And that which is true of the stages effected by the Spirit, is true also of the particular working which effects the stage: *it* is not the Spirit Himself, though a working of the Spirit. Limitation is thus introduced in immanence which is not in transcendence. How far this touches inspiration and infallibility we shall not seek to determine; nor shall we deal with its bearing upon ethics, except to observe that it does not admit of any working being of the Spirit which is a moral contradiction of His Nature and not a necessary stage to His final purpose. The effected result in each stage is 'the manifestation (*φανέρωσις*) of the Spirit,' the Spirit which is itself non-phenomenal becomes what is phenomenal, the Expression or Word of the Father. It is thus that the Son is immanent in creation. But the immanence of the Word in creation is also progressive; and, being according to the measure obtained by the in-working of the Spirit, is not full and final. Indeed, as the effective working of the Spirit is impeded now by sin, the expression of God in creation will not be so unclouded as at the beginning. The limitations by immanence are not of the Godhead itself, but are self-imposed conditions involved in the kind of universe which is chosen for creation.

The lines of thought followed in reference to the Trinity and Immanence lead on to questions concerning the Incarnation. A few of these only can be dealt with here, and those by way of suggestion and not adequately. The Incarnation is on the lines of the Immanence; with this important distinction, however, that whereas in immanence Personality in the Deity is related to other personalities in which He operates, in Incarnation He *is* the Personality. This is the fact underlying the Virgin Birth. Jesus is not a person acted upon by Divine Personality, however absolute and complete we may suppose that activity to be. He is in person God: God in the Person of the Son. The idea of the incarnation of God in the whole of humanity seems to be a confusion of immanence and incarnation proper. But when we speak of Jesus as the Person of the Son, it is necessary to observe that the Unity of the Godhead is not broken by Incarnation; He said, 'The Father that dwelleth in me, He doeth the works'; and when He breathed upon His disciples and said, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost,' He implied that the Spirit proceeded from Him as breath and yet was not identical with His Person. We have seen that the Immanence has limitations; not in the Persons, but in that which the relation to limited beings involves. The same thing is also, and for the same reason, involved in Incarnation. Before, however, proceeding further, let us recognize that we are faced by a problem which is possibly beyond human solution. It is, how a Personality of the Deity can display and possess the limitations characteristic of human personality and yet also be in conscious relation to the whole realm of fact, which is proper to the Eternal Son of God. It is an important step in every study to see a problem clearly. There is a side of God-in-flesh which is hidden from our view; we may find it later. It interests us, but it does not immediately concern us, because we have to do with the Incarnation, God-in-flesh, as presented to us. Here we observe limitations of knowledge, of experience, and also of action. These seem to imply limitation of powers; and in a sense they do. It was not until the end of His earthly life that Jesus said: 'All power

is given to me in heaven and in earth.' It is stated that on a certain occasion prior to this 'He could there do no mighty work' (Mark vi. 5), 'because of their unbelief' according to St. Matthew (xiii. 58), the circumstances in which He had to act limiting His power of action. By applying the principle underlying this we shall find that all the limitations of the Incarnation are due to the environment encircling God-in-flesh, and are required by the condition of things to meet which He is incarnate. These are not limitations of the Personality itself, since in other environment with its wholly different claims the same Personality would expand in powers to meet them, as the 'same Jesus' will do in His Kingdom. A philosopher under one awful pain is blind and deaf and dead to all but *it*; but let his personality be free from this dominating factor in its environment, and he will philosophize again, and understand better what personality means. If the age of Jesus had qualified itself to receive the Kingdom He brought near, it would have seen Him 'as He is'; but an Incarnation without any limitation of the Godhead, supposing it to be possible, would have struck such an age with something worse than fear—the death of reason, the paralyzing of freedom and more besides. The limitations, like the cross of which they were a part, were 'for us men and for our salvation.' But we must not misapprehend this limitation, as if it were without the Divine. The Father in His all-knowledge knows not only the infinite, but equally the finite. In Him there is the combination of the apparently incompatible. Before He made a finite man, He knew him throughout. It is not excluded from Deity to know finitely. The limitation in Incarnation of experience and knowledge is compatible with a Divine Personality; but the finite will be known with an intensity which is infinite in its character.

It follows from the limitations of Incarnation that there is a limitation of the Expression or Manifestation of God. As in the Immanence, so in the Incarnation, the Expression may be progressive. This is not inconsistent with truth in the imperfect stage, providing it is adequate to the present needs and consistent with the fuller revelation. The

distinction and severance suggested by the question 'Jesus or Christ?' can only be entertained on the supposition that the Personality of Jesus is not that same Personality which is the Christ. Our Lord Himself taught that He had much more to say, much more to reveal of Himself. The progress of His life from childhood to manhood, through death to resurrection and ascension, is one progressive laying aside of the limitations which He took at the Virgin Birth. And not until we see Him in the great Parousia, 'as He is,' shall we know the fullness of His Personality. 'It is by observing what a thing becomes that we learn the part it may hereafter play in the general scheme of things, and come to know its real nature, and estimate it at its real value.'[1] We do not know what a thing *is* until we know what comes out of it; nor do we know what a personality is until we see what comes out of it. According to the philosophy of Lotze the influence of a thing is a part of the thing—an extension of what is in it. Out of Jesus comes the concept of God; out of Jesus comes to His disciples the concept and powers of the Christ of the Church. It is not imposed upon Him, for without Him it was non-existent; it is out of Him because it is His Personality revealing itself.

The true Personality of Jesus Christ comes into view in the miraculous works which proceed from Him. Occasionally He seems to have used His miraculous power with a liberality springing from His wide sympathy; but generally there is a parsimony in its exercise which awakens wonder, unless one can see some explanation. It would help to a clearer knowledge of Him, and of the Divine method of action, if His miraculous works were studied less exclusively as exhibitions of power and more as revelations of the Worker. Why did He sometimes act? And why, when it seems He might have done so much, did He do nothing? We might suppose an actual limitation of power without detracting from His proper Personality; or, that the power in the Son was correspondent with something in those about Him, as when the woman with an issue of blood obtained healing

[1] Dr. F. B. Jevons in *Evolution*, p. 211.

and He said, 'Who touched me? For I perceive that virtue hath gone out of me.' The virtue was apparently apart from His will and in response to the 'faith' of the woman. It is perhaps hazardous to venture the suggestion, that the limitation of Miracle in the Son, that is in the Incarnation, was wholly due to man's state; and that the instances of its use are, so to speak, samples of what He will be when Humanity is at one with Him. But Miracle is also a revelation of the latent possibility of things. We are fast getting away from the notion that the physical order is a fixture, that it is incapable of change. The imperviousness of 'matter' to spiritual action and its indestructibility, or resistance of transmutation, are ideas fast falling into the limbo of discarded beliefs. Things are living entities; atoms have sentient souls; their behaviour is from their inner states; and their organization is a development of communion. The souls of things can be touched and changed to new experiences, and consequently to new modes of expression. Matter can be educated; and so can be made to behave otherwise. Miracle is the revelation of this capacity of things and illustrates it. There is no defiance of Nature, no breach of her laws; but a manifestation of the redemption to be effected by Jesus Christ of 'the whole creation,' that 'God may be all in all.'

It may be well, to avoid possible wrong inferences from the above statement of how we may think of the Trinity and allied matters, to add something further upon *thinking* of the Trinity. If, as we think we may, we accept Descartes' account of 'thought' as 'all that in us of which we are immediately conscious' so that 'all the operations of the will, of the imagination and senses, are thoughts,' we shall acknowledge that there is much thought in us which never rises into that higher region of intelligence in which thoughts are held up in attention and subjected to logical treatment and definition. And yet the reality of such thought is often seen in its effect upon action. We may say a man 'thinks' that money is everything without meaning that he has formulated such a proposition. When the child strikes

the thing that has hurt him, we say that he thinks it is to blame. Yet it takes a higher mind than the child's to formulate what enters into his thought. 'As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he'; and what he is, is what he has thought in his heart. It is possible to 'think' thus of the Trinity, and to think truly, without ever formulating the thought into an intellectual conception. There is such a thing as 'implicit faith.' It is open to question whether Plato taught the Trinity in making the world-soul the 'Divine Child,' 'only-begotten' of the Great God, and then making this world-soul to be drawn through the whole framework of the world and wrapping it round as an atmosphere; but it is not possible to doubt that his great master, Socrates, had drawn his nobility of soul from the immanent Deity. The Trinity is indivisible; and he who has touched God, or been touched effectually by Him, has had the 'thought' of the Trinity. In our estimate of the different religious faiths of the world we shall do well not to be content to take from their superficies the shades of thought that match or blend, and the bits that fit into each other, or into our own faith, as that of greatest value. This will be found in the ground on which they finally rest, in that which, imperfect though they may be, is necessary to their being at all; and which gave them a glory at the first which may have passed from them. The ancient Egyptian who first found in the image of his god that which was its 'ka,' and bowed under a sense of the Divine; or who placed himself under the hands of the image that he might be suffused with the mystic fluid of 'sa'; or the simple fetish-worshipper who first found Divinity in the plough or other instrument that did him service and called upon it there; all were recipients of thoughts of One very near to them, thoughts they could not lift, it may be, into clear conceptions, thoughts of Him who is the Eternal Trinity. The Catholic doctrine of the Trinity gives a true Catholicity.

ROBERT VAUGHAN.

Art. VI.—FOREIGN AND ENGLISH SCHOOLS OF PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

1. *Pastoraltheologie.* Von Dr. J. B. Renninger. Herausgegeben von Dr. F. A. Göpfert. (Freiburg i. B.: Herder'sche Buchhandlung. 1893.)
2. *Lehrbuch der praktischen Theologie.* Von Professor Dr. E. Chr. Achelis. Zweite Auflage. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. 1898.)
3. *England and the Church.* By Herbert Kelly, Director of the Society of the Sacred Mission. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1902.)
4. *Nouveau Memento de Vie Sacerdotale.* Par l'Abbé Charles Dementhon. Cinquième édition. (Paris: G. Beauchesne et Cie. 1907.)
5. *Zur Reform der praktischen Theologie.* Von Professor Lic. Dr. Carl Clemen. (Giessen: A. Töpelmann. 1907.)
6. *The Priest's Studies.* By T. B. Scannell, D.D. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1908.)
7. *Einführung in das theologische Studium.* Von Professor Dr. P. Wernle. Teil III. *Praktische Theologie.* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr. 1908.)
8. *The Cure of Souls.* Lectures in Pastoral Theology delivered in the Lent Term, 1908, in the Divinity Schools, Cambridge, and other Addresses. By W. Cunningham, D.D., F.B.A. (Cambridge University Press. 1908.)
9. *Pan Anglican Papers.* 'The Church and the Ministry.' (London: S.P.C.K. 1908.)
10. *Pastor Ovium: the Day Book of a Country Parson.* By J. H. Skrine. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1909.)
11. *The Priest of To-day: his Ideals and his Duties.* By the Rev. Thomas O'Donnell, C.M. (Dublin: Browne and Nolan. 1910.)

12. *Das Problem der praktischen Theologie.* Von Professor Dr. P. Drews. (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr. 1901.)
And very many other Works.

The Science of Pastoral Theology has yet to be constructed, and it would almost seem as if it could only be done by the Anglican Church. For to convert a study into a science two things are necessary—a sufficient area of observation and the spirit of free inquiry working through minds rightly trained. We still lack a satisfactory body of literature setting forth the results of the study of applied Christianity, and the Church of England has, at least, exceptional opportunities to produce it.

I.

These two assertions would probably be controverted by most. They would argue that the Roman Church has inherited a vast mass of experience based on the observation of centuries; that the activity of German Lutherans and of English and American Protestant bodies shews itself in the large and serious books on Practical Theology that they have issued; and that, whatever else may be wanting in our Church, there is no lack of literature on clerical work, for a continuous stream of little books issues year by year from the publishers and shews no sign of abating.

It need not be denied that the Roman Church inherits a priceless library from the past, or that that library is ample, practical, based on tested evidence, and varied. We have only to look at the bibliography at the beginning of such a book as Dr. J. B. Renninger's *Pastoraltheologie* to be convinced of the fact. Even if we cannot allow the Roman Church to claim exclusive possession of the inheritance of patristic lore, it has full right to use it as its own. But the writings of the Fathers are rather materials for Pastoral Theology than works upon it as a branch of theology. Such set treatises as exist are occasional in origin, as, for example, Basil's second Oration and Chrysostom's *De Sacerdotio*, or are, like Ambrose's *De Officiis*, based on a

literary comparison with classic models rather than on direct personal observation. Augustine's *De Catechizandis Rudibus* speaks from first-hand experience, and is the product of a great mind, but it deals merely with one part of a priest's duties. Gregory's *De Cura Pastorali* aims at comprehensiveness, but reflects the standard and scope with which the Dark Ages had to be contented.

Practical needs, again, called out numerous sermons, letters, and catechetical addresses, which were presumably found useful to guide others in after-life, since they were copied and preserved. Especially was it found necessary to keep and codify the literature of Church government, the advice of Church Orders, and the decisions of Councils. Through the Dark and Middle Ages there was a real development in the compilation of Penitentiaries, and in rubrical direction, but Canon Law, Casuistry, and Liturgica, though living studies in which much valuable work is being done, have only formed single departments of Pastoral Theology, which by Roman Catholic theologians has hardly been envisaged as a whole.

Again, the need of training the agents of applied Christianity has, no doubt, been faced in the Roman Church. The great developments of seminaries in the seventeenth century compelled a thorough study of a priest's calling, and a continual succession of minor works has appeared, dealing with it in its various aspects. Courses of study have been mapped out and duties defined. This literature is continually improving in character, as witness, for instance, two such recent works as Dr. T. B. Scannell's *The Priest's Studies*, and M. Charles Dementhon's admirable *Nouveau Memento de Vie Sacerdotale*. But rich as is this inheritance of the Roman Church, excellent as are such special treatises, in spite of the sense of completeness that their reading creates, a continued study of them leaves us with a sense of insufficiency and dryness. The mass of patristic and mediaeval literature dates from a pre-scientific age, or at least from one in which the conception of science was very different from ours, while the admirable manuals of practical work are, after all, mere administrative handbooks.

They instruct us how a certain machine is worked; they apply only to one set of circumstances. It would seem, moreover, as if it were impossible for the Roman Church to get free from its tradition of one mental attitude, while experience drawn from the inner life of a body that aims at homogeneity is of little value to those outside, and certainly offers only one field of observation.

When we turn from Roman Catholic writers to those of the Protestantism in which German Lutherans take the lead, we find ourselves in a very different atmosphere. Among them, as among Presbyterians and Nonconformists at home, as well as among American Protestant writers, there is no lack of free inquiry, and no antagonism to the scientific spirit. In freedom, in sincerity, in thoroughness of method there is little to be desired. Since the time of Schleiermacher, Practical Theology, as it is called in Germany, has been recognized as a separate science, and has received sufficient attention as such. A whole series of treatises has been issued, one after another, and a definite advance in the treatment of the subject can be marked. The two enormous volumes of Prof. E. C. Achelis' *Lehrbuch der praktischen Theologie* shew how thoroughly the study has been carried on by students trained in the most exhaustive and scientific school of German method. Moreover, the clear conception of the subject made possible by such separate treatment is leading men to realize the defects of current conceptions of pastoral duty, and the enormous field still waiting for a fuller treatment. Dr. Carl Clemen's *Zur Reform der praktischen Theologie*, the first instalment of a series of studies in different departments of the subject, is a model to illustrate the scientific attitude that is needed for real advance.

Yet, withal, the whole is marred in the eyes of an English churchman by a fatal defect. Admirable as is the method, and full as is the treatment, the area of observation is curiously narrow. Owing to their training in a non-catholic Christianity, the writers often confine their outlook to one race, they rarely allude to any centuries between the fifth and the fifteenth, they seem almost

unconscious of the existence of the Eastern, the Roman, or the Anglican Churches. The Christianity of their upbringing now lays little stress on any body of doctrine ; as a consequence they have little theory of religious education. The sense of corporate life is feeble, so there is little interest in questions of government or administration except in details. No stress is laid on corporate worship, so the department of liturgical study almost disappears. Mission work, with noble exceptions, is in danger of being regarded as mere extension, and the conception of growth, consolidation, training, or deepening of spiritual life is hardly perceptible. The idea of a ministerial priesthood is absent, and the consequent narrowing of the whole scope of the science is borne witness to by the name adopted. Pastoral Theology, the science of the work of man in helping his fellow-man in his relations to God, becomes Practical Theology, and is largely coloured by utilitarian aims.

As a consequence the main interest centres in preaching. On this subject there is an enormous literature. Much of it, in England and America at least, is of the worst possible type. Outline sermons, preachers' aids, promptuaries of stories for illustration, devices of all sorts for saving trouble, are multiplied to make possible somehow the enormous amount of preaching demanded. And even where the literature is good it is out of all proportion to the rest. Nor does the evil merely lie in this disproportion ; the habit of sermonizing is too often acquired, and betrays itself in what should be scientific treatises. The tendency to perpetual edification mars much of what is written by this school.

We shall not get much direct help from either Roman Catholic or Lutheran writers on Pastoral Theology. But we can imitate the breadth of view and the practical aims of the one class, and the thoroughness and open-mindedness of the other, while we can take warning by their defects and set ourselves to do our own work independently. Nor have we any right to criticize them except as a means of criticizing ourselves by comparison. We have not produced

such good work as they. We have hosts of little books, but few serious treatises. Our conception of the science is no clearer; our ideas of church work no less vague. We too have laid a disproportionate stress on preaching, and have too often allowed a 'preachy' tone to run through all we write. Much that is said is irrelevant, much bears the stamp of amateurishness. Much is occupied with mere detail instead of ordering detail to illustrate great principles. Much is merely a record of personal experience or opinion, valuable as a single element of evidence, but of no further worth. Many statements are put forth without being tested; much is slovenly and unreal. A low standard of attainment and a poor ideal is often all that is upheld. We have even more need than the Lutherans of a 'reform of Practical Theology.'

But, in spite of all this, we have a better field of work than any other body. Our conception of Pastoral Theology is not limited to mere administration, as in the over-organized Latin Church, and the administration that we have is of a type far more rich and varied. We have opportunities for experiment and are not committed to any one system. Our Church is many sided, and our work in touch with many departments of life. We have by far the best field of observation. Moreover, as a Catholic body we inherit a tradition from the past, by our corporate life we can keep our work in due proportion in its parts, for what one student does is balanced by the studies of another. Specialization loses its dangers when its agents form part of a body in touch with other activities and interests, and by our unity in one common life we are safeguarded from that over-elaboration of particular elements which is often the destruction of scientific work.

Our immediate need, therefore, is the adequate training of a body of students. As in ancient Athens, there is among us no little interest and much public talk, but there are too many sophists, and, as a consequence, no small measure of popular contempt. We want a Socrates to make us test our terms and find out our facts. Or rather, we want what he advised, the educating of a body of young men as

philosophers to be our rulers in the Church when they shall have attained to years of sufficient experience and discretion.

II.

What materials have we at hand for the education of such a school of students? In the way of definite treatises, it must be confessed, very little that is of much value; but as standard text-books we have the good fortune to possess two works which rank among the great books of the world, which, moreover, have prevented the Pastoral Theology of the Church of England from ever sinking below a certain level, and have from their position as undisputed classics always remained for it a powerful instrument for revival and reform. These two works are the Book of Common Prayer and Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*.

England had the rare chance to secure her Prayer Book before the confusion that was, it would seem, necessarily entailed by the Reformation. Cranmer, whatever his other qualities may have been, was a great translator. He was a translator not merely of Latin words into English, but of the Latin spirit into its counterpart in our race. He was in power at a cardinal point, and held together the old and the new. He possessed the liturgical sense that grows up with years of Catholic tradition, and is hardly re-acquired by those who have not been born into it, while his work was practically completed before the crash came in which both traditional learning and liturgical sense were for so long destroyed. The few comparatively unimportant parts that were left unfinished have remained incomplete ever since; the rubrics are still a source of confusion; the Burial Service remains a torso; where later hands have touched the book they have only weakened and disfigured it. We have thus a book thoroughly English, and one, therefore, able to be used during all these years, in varying developments of our society, and by men of very different types of mind, adaptable as are all great works, yet with a full Catholic tradition, able to respond to the revivals

of the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, never insular, appealing to the whole man, built up by the experience of ages, flexible in practical use, broad based on human experience, and as such containing just what is necessary for scientific Pastoral Theology.

After the worst confusion of the Reformation was over Hooker appeared, a pastoral theologian of the first rank. It is true that his special pastoral field, that in which he was called on to help men spiritually, was the area of controversy. That was necessitated by the exigencies of the time. But he 'thought it convenient to wade through the whole cause, following that method which searcheth for truth by the causes of truth.'[1] He was, as Dean Church points out, 'one of those rare controversialists who are more intent on showing why their opponents are wrong than even the fact that they are so, and who are not afraid of the challenge to build as well as destroy, or of the task of replacing what they have refuted by a positive construction which invites the test of a wide application to facts.'[2]

His work has, that is, exactly the scientific spirit; he bases all he writes on laws, even finds it necessary to being by investigating the whole nature of law, while his learning ensures these laws being built up on wide generalizations from tested evidence. By the side of this it is a minor point that, as in the case of the Prayer Book, his language is a model which 'first revealed to the nation what English prose might be'; his spirit is essentially Anglican and his ideas curiously modern.

Hooker's immense influence was seen later in those who followed. Andrewes is becoming more and more recognized as typical of much that is best in our Church. His secret influence through his *Devotions* is to-day enormous. Laud's influence, on the other hand, was felt more immediately, though for the full appreciation of the value of his work we have had to wait till recent years. In many ways it was characteristic of English churchmanship, in his interest in

[1] *Epistle Dedicatorie*, § 3.
[2] Introduction to Hooker, bk. i. p. 16.

social questions, in the practical nature of his reforms, in the stress he laid on matters of ritual—an emphasis generally laid by way of objection to ceremonial—in his care for the close association of the clergy with university life. But he was working against a strong body of opinion that was even more typically English, and so influenced by force and opposition rather than by interpreting the national character. Still none of these three men created a science of Pastoral Theology. Cranmer's work was the outcome of a trained sense of liturgical fitness; Hooker's a model, but a single piece of scientific construction; Laud's a practical experiment, but merely personal and empirical. Each provided materials, but a systematic theology was not deduced.

III.

In George Herbert's *A Priest to the Temple, or Country Parson* (1632), we get the first work of English Pastoral Theology consciously written as such. It marks the beginning of a new school, and shews a complete break with tradition. The ideals of life, the circumstances and details, are all essentially those of our country. It is on right lines in that it begins by considering the agent; for the first step needed is, as we saw, the training of the right type of student; and it is based on first-hand observation and direct experience. But there the science stops. And when the conception of a parson is analyzed, what does it amount to? There is very little in his duty that is professional. He is to look after the church, but only a bare decency is required. He is to catechize, but there is no hint of any theory of education. He is to celebrate the Eucharist—at most once a month. He is to be ready to hear confessions, but evidently the practice is little observed. He is to visit, but apparently merely to give doles. The ideal is little more than that of a Christian gentleman,[1] the head

[1] *Cf.* the 'Preface to the Reader' by Barnabas Oley in his second edition. 'The advantage of doing God service, which height of birth gives to a nobleman or gentleman, over what a clerk of lower

of local society but with few special duties, the professional good man, learned and courteous, feeling himself in a false position and fearful of becoming a bore, if he tries to be more than this, frankly bribing people to come to church. We gather an impression of the Country Parson as a lovable and devout man, of a type we all know and are the better for knowing. But there is very little substance in the conception of his duty. His life is meagre, poor, vague, isolated; his methods casual and promiscuous. The book contributes just one piece of experience, direct but merely personal.

With Burnet's *Discourse of the Pastoral Care* we enter a new atmosphere. His is the earliest English work that aims at being a special and full treatise on Pastoral Theology. The idea of the work was suggested by Gregory's *De Cura Pastorali*, and there was a closer parallel in circumstances, in the attitude and qualifications of the writer, and in the conditions of contemporary church life, than he probably realized. If it cannot be said to have founded a school, it greatly influenced later writers both in England and abroad.[1] It was planned as a whole, is ordered and complete, the work of a comprehensive and powerful mind. Moreover, the treatment of the subject is on right lines. After emphasizing his dissatisfaction with the prevailing type of church work (all works on Pastoral Theology seem to make the same complaint in every age), Burnet examines the fundamental nature of the clerical calling, tracing its ideals from those found in the New Testament through the course of history down to its special English development; then he considers the primary question of practical efficiency, namely, the training and

parentage hath, is very considerable. The truth taught by them is sooner believed; a reproof bestowed by them is better received; an example of virtue shewed by them makes deeper impression than the same coming from one of meaner extraction would do. This observation I first made in those two great lights of our church, Dr. Fern, Lord Bishop of Chester, who was a knight's son, and Dr. Hammond, who was of an ancient family. And the reader will observe more in this book, whose author was a person nobly descended.'

[1] Cp. Vinet, *Théologie Pastorale* [E. T.], c. i. p. 20.

preparation needed for the ministry, with a full working out of various branches of necessary study, and finally considers the duties of a parish priest point by point.

The scheme is admirable in conception, but when we come to examine it in detail we cannot help being struck with the poverty of its ideal. The activities of the priest are confined to mere personal and individual efforts; his duties amount to little more than preaching, excellent advice about which fills nearly all the pages devoted to practical work. The clergyman is no more than a sort of moral policeman in the parish. The whole is quite out of sympathy with real life, for it is a seventeenth-century bishop's Charge to his clergy. He speaks all through *de haut en bas*. He obviously moves in a different world from that of his clergy, and so is doubly removed from the spiritual life of the people. The treatise resolves itself into another expression of a purely individual opinion, an opinion of an exceptionally able man, no doubt, but of one who has taken no pains to find out what even his clergy think. The style is the natural outcome of his attitude, pompous and preachy, wearisome in its rolling phrases and utterly unreal—and yet, withal, so English.

Later writers abound, but they carry on the same tradition. They adopt almost invariably the standpoint of Herbert or Burnet. They either give a single piece of individual experience, or speak unreally and with condescension. Jeremy Taylor, who was not a conspicuous success in the parish, gives in his *Rules and Advice to the Clergy* a series of general precepts written with all his peculiar charm, but containing for the most part merely the sort of counsel a man can give equally well to himself. It is the prototype of a whole family of later little books of edification. Bishop Wilson's *Parochialia or Instruction to the Clergy on the Discharge of their Parochial Duty* is excellent, practical, and detailed, but it is a bishop's Charge delivered autocratically to his clergy. It speaks from experience, but reveals no patient spirit of inquiry. Baxter's *Reformed Pastor* contains a valuable account of the way in which he established catechizings in his parish, but

the rest is mere words. Bishop Spratt, in his *Visitation Discourse to the Clergy of the Diocese of Rochester* (1695), takes eight pages to tell them to say their office daily, and enjoins it as excellent practice in reading which will improve their delivery of sermons! Bishop Bull, in his *Visitation Sermon and Charge, A Companion for the Candidate for Holy Orders, or the Great Importance of the Priestly Office,* embellishes his oratory with Hebrew, Latin, and Greek quotations, but contents himself with generalities; while Bishop Gibson, in his *Directions to the Clergy of the Diocese of London,* issued in 1724, and in his Charge of 1742, if slightly more practical and a little less oratorical, emphasizes quite elementary conventional clerical duties. Nor are Bishop Hort's *Instructions to the Clergy of the Diocese of Tuam given at his Primary Visitation,* any more helpful; they merely repeat the traditional advice usually given on such occasions.

The above, with the exception of Baxter's *Reformed Pastor,* were collected and published by the delegates of the Oxford University Press in 1807, under the title of *The Clergyman's Instructor.* This 'Collection of Tracts on the Minister's Duties' was frequently reprinted, and new editions appeared at intervals during the next fifty years. It may therefore be taken as representing fairly the official and dominant conception of Pastoral Theology through the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The Evangelical revival no doubt introduced a new spirit of earnestness and added a new element of missionary activity; the Tractarian movement made a new note sound in its more spiritual conception of the priestly office; the industrial change brought about a development of parochial work by shifting the centre of English life to the towns; but the stock remains essentially the same, and can be easily recognized as the foundation of writings of the great mid-Victorian period such as those of Liddon or Blunt. The new enthusiasm works on the old lines. The deeper devotion is but grafted on, and the new developments of practical work are mere extensions of country methods to utterly changed conditions.

It would be invidious to particularize in speaking of the more modern type of manual of Pastoral Theology. The books written are almost all on the same lines, though the language is more modern. The same complaints are made, the same abuses (with the exception of non-residence) remain unreformed. The same methods are advised; the same emphasis is laid on preaching. They alternate between the relating of individual personal experiment, and the repetition of academic or episcopal ideals, valuable and inspiring, but in no way scientific. The conception of the duties of the priest has never really got free from the alternative of that of the moral policeman (whether squarson or superintendent of boys' clubs), or that of the professional good man who is not to be too different from a layman.

To sum up, we have the advantage of possessing two great literary works—a liturgy in the vernacular, necessarily influencing all we do, with possibilities of development all the greater, perhaps, from the fact that neglect has at least kept us free from an inflexible tradition, and a standard work of theology treating fundamentally most of our characteristic features of church life. We have a tradition of learning and culture, of a clergy in touch with national life, accustomed to take part in all sorts of social movements, ready to be influenced by current thought. The weakness of our organization at least allows us freedom to try new methods; our Catholic tradition has kept a framework to hold these together; and practical duties stand in no danger of being neglected.

IV.

What is wanted, then, to build up a national ideal? What is needed to make the general conception of the work scientific? The first step in scientific process is to define the subject considered. The work is then seen as a whole and in relation to other sciences. When it has been defined, its various parts may be examined in proportion to one another and in their mutual relationships. This will best be done by considering the agent in Pastoral

Theology. For in his personality the various departments of pastoral work find their connexion, and when a clear four-square ideal of clerical work has been traced out the training of the student will be directed to a definite end. The diversity of his functions can best be examined as correlated in a single individual, and the subjects of a school can then be elaborated with less fear of their becoming academic and losing touch with real life. We want to retain the personal first-hand element of church work, with its scope for the full realization of the parson's individuality against the somewhat mechanical conception (as it seems to us) of the Roman Catholic priesthood, and to maintain the proportion and balance of his duties as against the one-sided development of Evangelical Protestantism.

A clergyman, according to the English ideal, works in four capacities : as a student, as a manager, as a governor, and as a missionary, it is his office to help his fellow-men in things spiritual. His calling runs parallel with secular callings, often dealing with the same material, but always with the distinction that where others render mutual service in outward things, he is concerned with the inner spiritual life sacramentally mediated by them. The methods may be the same and the standard of efficiency must be no lower, but the inspiration and outlook is quite another.

He must be a student. As a student of books it is his duty to further the cause of theological learning ; by original work, if he can, and, if he cannot, by studying the works of others for the purpose of teaching and making the results of research available for the masses. But he must also be a student of human documents, learning to discern the needs of men and to read their characters, observing the phenomena of spiritual life, testing them and experimenting so far as can be done with reverence for the souls of his fellow-creatures. He must be a student of the laws and the eternal truths of religious life as revealed in history and as manifesting themselves in the world around. He must believe in knowledge as of prior value to bodily activity. He must train himself to penetrate unerringly to the moral and spiritual issues in all that he sees around him.

As a musician educates his ear he must learn to sharpen his perceptions of right and wrong, or of religious import, in the current literature, in doings of society, in accepted customs of business, in social policy, so that he may be able to judge and interpret them to his fellow-men. He must discipline his inner life to this end.

He is also a manager in an institution, that is, an administrator of things immediately under his hand in a particular part of the Church. This side of his work is practical, direct, and detailed. In the parish he has duties to a limited area and a definite number of men. He has to deal with individual souls as the general practitioner deals with their bodies. The religious life of the parish centres in the church, and he has, with others, the care of the material things necessary for corporate expression of religious life, the guardianship of church buildings and furniture. He is responsible for the organization of public worship, and has to see that nothing becomes a hindrance to the reality of devotion. Like the manager of a business, like a director of a museum, library, school, or institution, he often has to look after things rather than to do them; but as they, by so doing, help the flow of commerce, open the way to knowledge, or make available social benefits, so he attends to details to make straight the way to the people for corporate and individual access to Grace. He is the servant or minister to the Christian public, and as such is charged with its official representation, conducting its worship, the mouthpiece of its corporate prayer, keeping up the round of its formal worship day by day, maintaining the atmosphere in which religion thrives, charged with the ministry of the Word and Sacraments.

As a governor in a polity his work is wider. He is not merely the minister of the congregation, but in the Orders of the whole Church. He therefore has to deal with larger matters not under his immediate supervision. Like a civil servant who works from an office, he is charged with his part of the government of the whole body. He is an official of a corporate institution, bound to consider the welfare of the whole and the interaction of its parts. In the parish

he must act with a definite theory of government. He must do his own work in such a way that it may co-operate with that of his fellow-clergymen in other parishes. He must do everything constitutionally on a thought-out conception of his calling, considering always the larger issues at stake. So far as its nature as scientific is concerned, this conception need not be sacerdotal or unsacerdotal, but it must be based on a reasoned theory, and be intelligible and explicable. In the diocese he must take his share in combined action, preserving his proportion of parochial and general interests. Here he is dealing with matters the results of which he cannot directly trace, and which therefore need for their handling the special gifts of government.

Finally, he is a missionary. This aspect of his work is not in danger of being lost sight of while preaching forms so large a part of his duties. But it need not be limited to this single method. Writing, distribution of literature, 'practical work,' above all, conscientious discharge of ordinary duties, are varied ways of extending the influence of the Church. But all such work of propaganda must be undertaken after strict examination of its real effectiveness, and he must be always ready to drop methods that are proved useless, and to originate new plans which experience or analogy suggest as likely to succeed.

One or other of these elements may predominate in the work of any individual. Indeed, specialization, either in study, in parish work, in diocesan service, or in missionary activity, is necessary for effective pioneer service; but the specialist should bear in mind that his labour is but one element which he offers to the common catholic cause, and that his deficiency is made up in the Communion of Saints by that which every joint supplieth. And the creation of a scientific school of Pastoral Theology is needed in which to study each department separately and in its relation to the whole, so that a body of students may be trained in it for their future work.

Art. VII.—THE BIBLICAL TEACHING ON DIVORCE.

1. *Occasional Papers on Missionary Subjects.* First Series, No. 8. By F. W. Puller, M.A., of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Cowley. (Oxford Mission to Calcutta. 1886.)
2. *Holy Matrimony.* By O. D. Watkins, M.A., Archdeacon of Lucknow. (London: Rivingtons. 1895.)
3. *The Jewish Law of Divorce.* By D. W. Amram. (London: David Nutt. 1897.)
4. *The Sermon on the Mount.* By Charles Gore, D.D., Canon of Westminster [now Bishop of Birmingham]. (London: John Murray. 1896.)
5. *A Dictionary of the Bible.* Edited by James Hastings, D.D. Five Volumes. Articles 'Marriage' and 'Sermon on the Mount.' (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1898–1904.)
6. *Encyclopaedia Biblica.* Edited by T. K. Cheyne, D.D., and J. Sutherland Black, LL.D. Four Volumes. Article 'Marriage.' (London: A. and C. Black. 1899–1903.)
7. *The Jewish Encyclopedia.* Articles 'Adultery' and 'Divorce.' (New York and London: Funk and Wagnalls. 1901– .)
8. *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics.* Edited by James Hastings, D.D. Volume I. Article 'Adultery.' (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1908.)
9. *The Teaching of our Lord as to the Indissolubility of Marriage.* By S. L. Tyson. With Introduction by the Bishop of Tennessee. (Sewanee, Tennessee: The University Press. 1909.)
10. *Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion.* Holden at Lambeth, July 27 to August 5, 1908. *Encyclical Letter from the Bishops with the Resolutions and Reports.* No. VIII. Report of the Committee appointed to consider and report upon the subject of Marriage Problems: (*a*) *Divorce.* (London: S.P.C.K. 1908.)

And other Works.

At a time when a Royal Commission is sitting to discuss possible alterations in our Divorce Laws, there will be not a few who are asking themselves what is the real teaching of the Bible, and particularly of Christ, on this subject. It is well known that great uncertainty has always attended its interpretation. The followers of Moses disputed as to the true meaning of the legislation which bears his name, and the followers of the Greater than Moses have been equally doubtful as to the right application of His teaching on one important point: if we may judge from the varying versions of it recorded in our Gospels, the doubt must have arisen in the very first generation of His disciples. And the words of the greatest of His Apostles are no less ambiguous. We may not be able to reach any decisive conclusions ourselves, but we may try to state the facts impartially, and it may be that important results will follow from this very ambiguity.

I.

We must first look briefly at the teaching of the Old Testament. It is quite true that there are few who would now consider this at all decisive on such a point. The social conditions presupposed by the Old Testament legislation have entirely passed away; and to attempt to impose its regulations on a modern civilization is to mistake the whole purpose for which they were given. In some cases they are too strict and too detailed. But in others they are not strict enough. We do not reject the laws of the Hebrew Theocracy with a regretful sigh as representing an ideal to which our own imperfect civilization cannot rise; where we ignore them, it is very often because we recognize that they have been transcended by Christianity. Morality has grown like most else in this world of evolution. If we appeal to the Old Testament on a subject such as that before us, it is not to find detailed rules by which we are to be bound to-day, perhaps drawing the dangerous corollary that where such rules do not exist we are free to do what we like. We have a double purpose: (*a*) to trace the direction in which the God-guided conscience of the chosen people was moving,

that is to get at the principles which were gradually being formulated; and (*b*) to realize the position of the problem in our Lord's time; it is only when we put it in its proper setting that we can fully appreciate His teaching.

The first point to notice is that divorce is taken for granted in the Old Testament. It was not the result of legislation, but of immemorial custom; for it was the traditional right of the husband, among the Jews as among the Arabs, to 'put away his wife.'[1] And the passages where divorce is used as a figure of Jehovah's dealings with His people[2] prove conclusively that it was not a practice regarded with disfavour by the religious sentiment of the Hebrews. The fact that the priests and the high priest are specially forbidden to marry a divorced woman[3] implies that the layman was free to do so, and this Deut. xxiv. 2 states expressly. Mr. Amram[4] finds that no odium attached to the divorced wife; if a priest's daughter, she might eat of the holy things.[5] And with one or two minor restrictions, she could marry whom she would after an interval of three months, with the exception of her paramour, when she had been divorced for adultery.

The most important passage from every point of view is Deut. xxiv. 1–4, the only place where we find any detailed legislation on the subject.

'When a man taketh a wife, and marrieth her, then it shall be, if she find no favour in his eyes, because he hath found some unseemly thing in her, that he shall write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house. And when she is departed out of his house, she may go and be another man's wife. And if the latter husband hate her, and write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house; or if the latter husband die, which took her to be his wife; her former husband, which sent her away, may not take her again to be his wife, after that she is defiled; for that is abomination before the Lord.'

[1] Compare *e.g.* Gen. xxi. 14.
[2] Is. l. 1; Jer. iii. 8; *cf.* the story of Hosea.
[3] Lev. xxi. 7, 14.
[4] *The Jewish Law of Divorce*, p. 103.
[5] Lev. xxii. 12, 13.

The exact interpretation of this law caused great trouble to the Jewish exegetes, though there is not really much doubt about it. The question was, what was meant by the condition 'if she find no favour in his eyes, because he hath found some unseemly thing[1] in her'? As is well known, the school of Hillel laid the emphasis on the first clause, and therefore interpreted the second of the most trivial things, practically 'for any cause,' while the followers of Shammai rightly laid stress on the second clause, but wrongly confined it to *unchastity*. The truth lies between the two: the vague nature of the expression 'nakedness of a thing' (*cf.* xxiii. 14), and the fact that in xxii. 22 death is the penalty for unchastity, shews that something more must be meant; 'it signifies most probably some improper or indecent behaviour.'[2]

As we should expect, human nature being what it is, the lax interpretation was eagerly accepted in spite of the stern attitude of some of the Rabbis, and the stricter teaching of Malachi (ii. 13–16), who strongly condemns the man who 'deals treacherously against the wife of his youth.'[3]

Divorce was in fact encouraged by the action of Ezra in compelling his countrymen to put away their foreign wives (Ezra ix. 10), and it became terribly frequent. Josephus[4] represents the opinion of his day, when he quotes Moses as saying, 'He that desires to be separated from his wife for any cause whatsoever (and many such causes happen among

[1] Lit. *the nakedness of a thing* (עֶרְוַת דָּבָר).

[2] LXX. ἄσχημον πρᾶγμα. *Cf.* Driver, *Deuteronomy* (Int. Crit. Com.) *ad loc.* His notes on the passage are an exhaustive summary of the Old Testament data.

[3] The words of a recent Jewish commentator are worth quoting in this connexion: 'To his eternal honour, Shammai, an older contemporary of Jesus, said it [the phrase in Deuteronomy] meant, and only meant, unchastity. But to his eternal dishonour Hillel said it meant all kinds of other reasons as well. The Rabbinic law most unfortunately followed Hillel, and it allowed, and still allows, divorce for many and many a reason over and above and outside of adultery.' (Montefiore, *Synoptic Gospels*, i. p. 235.)

[4] *Ant. Jud.* IV. viii. 23.

men), let him in writing give assurance that he will never use her as his wife any more'; and he fully acted up to his principles by himself divorcing two wives, and marrying a third. The Mishna allows divorce for violation of the Law or of Jewish customs, *e.g.* breaking a vow, appearing in public with dishevelled hair, or conversing indiscriminately with men—in fact, the right was almost unlimited.

To return to the Deuteronomic legislation: it illustrates the important point to which attention has already been called. It did not create the habit of divorce; it found it in undisputed possession of the field; what it did was to restrict and safeguard the practice. As our Lord reminded the Pharisees, Moses did not *command* the giving of a bill of divorcement; he only *suffered* it. When we look at the regulations of Deuteronomy we see that they were in fact intended not to make divorce easier, but to make it harder. There must be some definite ground for the divorce, and this is to be embodied in the bill of divorcement (technically known as the *get*). This procedure suggests a formal charge, brought before a public official, involving delay and presumably expense: legal documents usually mean fees to someone; in fact, as time went on the Mishna greatly multiplied the formalities and the documents[1]; one learned in the law had to assist at the process, and it was his business to reconcile the parties if possible, a feature which some of the witnesses before the Royal Commission are anxious to introduce into our own procedure. Further, the regulation that the *divorcée* could not return to her husband after contracting a second marriage was intended to act as a deterrent against a hasty divorce. In two cases[2] the husband permanently forfeited his right to a divorce.

But side by side with this restrictive legislation, and ultimately of far greater importance, there was formulated the principle of the sanctity and true nature of the marriage

[1] *Jewish Encyclopedia, s.v.* 'Divorce.' In view of the suggestions now being made, it is curious to note that it was laid down that a man could *not* divorce his wife, if she were insane or in captivity!

[2] Deut. xxii. 19, 29.

tie: 'Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh.' It is quite true that the words of Gen. ii. 24 may have *originally* referred to what are called *beena* marriages,[1] that is the primitive type of marriage where the husband left his own tribe ('his father and mother'), and became a member of his wife's clan.[2] But the writer evidently used the words in a higher sense, since these marriages were already out of date when he wrote; perhaps he is giving a new meaning to an old saying. It is clearly a case where the words carry with them, essentially and naturally, a profound and spiritual application, however little it may have been realized. As we know, Christ in His quotation of them, recognized them as embodying the true ideal of marriage. It is significant that as that ideal is expressed on the last page of the Old Testament,[3] so it stands clearly formulated on the first. The second chapter of Genesis may not be actually the most ancient part of the Old Testament, but 'from the beginning' refers to the ideal which was implicit in the marriage state from the first, though it was only slowly realized by the conscience, and still more slowly, and indeed not yet completely, embodied in practice. Certainly the principle was never strictly applied in the Old Testament: the Mosaic legislation recognized the hardness of men's hearts, or the weakness of human nature; in the modern formula, legislation to be effective cannot be too far in advance of public opinion. But there the principle stood, a Divine ideal to shame the laxity of man's actual practice, and a germ which had within it the promise of far-reaching developments.

[1] *Cf.* W. Robertson Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia.*

[2] Traces of such marriages in historical times may be found in the stories of Jacob, Moses, and Samson.

[3] In Mal. ii. 14–16, referred to above: 'The Lord hath been witness between thee and the wife of thy youth, against whom thou has dealt treacherously, though she is thy companion and the wife of thy covenant. . . . Therefore take heed to your spirit, and let none deal treacherously against the wife of his youth. For the Lord, the God of Israel, saith that he hateth putting away.'

II.

For Christians, and we hope we may add, for a Christian country, the crux of the matter is the teaching of the New Testament, and, above all, of our Lord. We will take the latter first. It raises, as we know, questions of considerable difficulty. Briefly the problem is this. In St. Mark x. 11 and St. Luke xvi. 18 our Lord forbids divorce absolutely; in St. Matthew v. 32, xix. 9 (the latter passage being parallel to the Marcan passage) He seems to admit an exception—'except for fornication.' A comparison will be instructive.

St. Mark x. 2–12.

And there came unto him Pharisees, and asked him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife? tempting him. And he answered and said unto them, What did Moses command you? And they said, Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement, and to put her away. But Jesus said unto them, For your hardness of heart he wrote you this commandment. But from the beginning of the creation, male and female made he them. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and the twain shall become one flesh: so that they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. And in the house the disciples asked him again of this matter. And he saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and

St. Matthew xix. 3–11.

And there came unto him Pharisees, tempting him, and saying, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife *for every cause?* And he answered and said, Have ye not read, that he which made them from the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and the twain shall become one flesh? So that they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. They say unto him, Why then did Moses command to give a bill of divorcement, and to put her away? He saith unto them, Moses for your hardness of heart suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it hath not been so. And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, *except for fornication*, and

marry another, committeth adultery against her: and if she herself shall put away her husband, and marry another, she committeth adultery.

shall marry another, committeth adultery: and he that marrieth her when she is put away committeth adultery. The disciples say unto him, If the case of the man is so with his wife, it is not expedient to marry.

St. Luke xvi. 18.

Every one that putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and he that marrieth one that is put away from a husband committeth adultery.

St. Matthew v. 31, 32.

It was said also, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: but I say unto you, that every one that putteth away his wife, *saving for the cause of fornication*, maketh her an adulteress: and whosoever shall marry her when she is put away committeth adultery.

Before dealing with the questions in dispute, it will be well to call attention to one or two general features in the narratives. The saying apparently stood both in the original Marcan document, and in 'Q' or the Logia, *i.e.* in both of the two main sources of our present Gospels; it is one of the few 'doubly attested sayings' of Christ.[1] This fact indicates the importance attached to it by the first generation of Christians. We do not wonder at this since, on a matter which had an urgent and practical bearing, it ran directly counter to the opinion and prevalent habits of the time. We have seen the frequency of divorce amongst Jews; it was, of course, equally common in the Graeco-Roman world. It is interesting to notice the possible setting of the incident. Professor Burkitt[2] suggests that it is connected with the retirement or flight from the territory of Herod Antipas, narrated in the eighth chapter of St. Mark. After the

[1] Professor Burkitt (*The Gospel History and its Transmission*, pp. 148 ff.) reckons thirty-one.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 98.

journey to the north, 'Jesus has reached the neutral ground of Judaea and begun again to teach in public.' He is faced with a test question. He is the successor of the Baptist; will He take up the same attitude, and condemn the immorality of Herod? Professor Burkitt describes the sequel:

'I do not think the answer was what His questioners desired. Here as elsewhere our Lord had as little taste for the leaven of the Pharisees as for the leaven of Herod. If they had expected Him to rail at Antipas now that He was safe in Judaea, they were disappointed. To Him the general relations of man and wife mattered more than the amours of this or that half-heathen princelet, and—what must have surprised and shocked His interlocutors—mattered more than the very words of this or that text out of the Pentateuch. His answer offered no palliation for Antipas and Herodias, but His emphatic insistence on the sanctity of marriage is based on the natural constitution of man as opposed to the regulations in the Mosaic Law.'[1]

As usual, our Lord pays no attention to the possible casuistry of the particular case, but fastens at once on the principle. He appeals from 'Moses' to 'Moses,' and in place of a temporary and imperfect legislative regulation He puts the eternal and absolute ideal. And if we add here the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount,[2] we see how He introduced a new and far-reaching principle, in stamping the wilful thought of sin, in this and other respects, as being as sinful as the act. Mr. Montefiore[3] describes this as 'the first really *original* utterance in the series of contrasts, as compared with the best Rabbinic teaching.' And it will be well for us if, in our discussion of the difficulties raised, we do not allow our attention to be distracted from what is *not* open to dispute, the fundamental principle which is of universal application.

[1] Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 99.

[2] St. Matt. v. 27 ff.: 'Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt not commit adultery; but I say unto you, that every one that looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.'

[3] *Synoptic Gospels*, ii. p. 508.

The difficulties are, however, important, and must be faced. It will clear the way if we dispose of one or two preliminary points, ruling out interpretations which are forced and impossible.

(i) *Fornication*[1] cannot in the passages before us be confined to 'sin before marriage.'[2] The rather peculiar phrase in St. Matt. v. 32[3] probably represents the much-discussed expression in Deuteronomy (see above, p. 157), which, whatever else it means, does not mean merely 'sin before marriage.' The word 'Porneia' with its cognates is commoner than 'Moicheia,' etc. (adultery), both in the LXX and in the New Testament,[4] and is a general word, covering unchastity of every description; in 1 Thess. iv. 3 it undoubtedly *includes* adultery; Hos. ii. 5, Amos vii. 17, 1 Cor. v. 1 are other instances of a similar use. Again, none of the Fathers for the first three centuries adopted this explanation.[5] On some points this argument would be of little weight, but *with regard to the interpretation of a current Greek word* it is nearly decisive. We need only add that the general sense of the passage is clearly against it; it is admittedly only a desperate expedient to avoid the conclusions which would seem to result from the natural interpretation of the passage, and has found very little support.

(ii) A second attempt to cut the knot has been made by the suggestion that in the case of adultery our Lord allows not divorce *a vinculo* with permission to remarry, but only separation *a mensa et thoro*. This has been the prevalent view of Roman Catholic commentators, but it is entirely inadmissible, both exegetically and historically. It is true

[1] *πορνεία.*

[2] In Watkins' *Holy Matrimony*, p. 168, a long quotation from Döllinger is given, which forcibly maintains this view.

[3] *παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας.*

[4] St. Paul only uses the *μοῖχος* group in Romans and 1 Cor. vi. 9; he never uses *μοιχεία*. In LXX *μοιχεύω*, etc., always represents נאף; *πορνεύω*, זנה or קדשׁ.

[5] See Watkins, *op. cit.* p. 221, where the references are fully discussed. Writers who adopted the ordinary view of *πορνεία* include Hermas, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, etc.; cf. *op. cit.* p. 343, where quotations are given from later writers.

that the text of both the passages of St. Matthew is in some disorder, chiefly owing to attempts to assimilate the two, and that there is some MS. authority for the omission of the actual references to remarriage.[1]

But on the most favourable view of the MSS. evidence, there is no real support for the interpretation in question. Christ is implicitly dealing with the Deuteronomic passage which expressly allowed remarriage; if He were in fact substituting for that permission permission for a separation, and not for a full divorce with the right of remarriage, the point must have been made clear. The undisputed words of v. 32 shew that remarriage is in fact in His mind; the word used throughout for 'put away' is the regular technical term for *divorce*.[2] Both in Jewish and Roman law divorce always carried with it a full liberty to remarry; none of His hearers could have imagined that it did not do so then. Hence *if our Lord allowed divorce under certain conditions, He allowed remarriage.*

We are therefore bound to admit that the two passages [3]

[1] In xix. 9, B. omits καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται, but substitutes from v. 32, ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσας μοιχᾶται, words that assume the remarriage of the *divorcée*; in v. 32, D. and Old Latin omit καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσῃ μοιχᾶται, but here again the probability of remarriage is sufficiently implied in the previous words.

[2] Where St. Paul in 1 Cor. vii. is speaking of *separation*, he uses χωρίζεσθαι, not ἀπολύειν.

[3] St. Matt. xix. 9 is the clearer, but there is not much doubt about St. Matt. v. 32 either. As Professor Harnack has pointed out, the whole sentence is condensed, and is put in such a form as to emphasize the all-round nature of the evil done; the man himself, and his wife, and the man she subsequently marries, are all guilty of adultery. It is often pointed out that the interpretation of the qualification which we are urging as the only natural one, implicitly gives the guilty wife the permission to marry again. So it does: the underlying thought of the exception is that adultery *ipso facto* dissolves the bond, and that of course for both parties. The distinction between the remarriage of the innocent and guilty party does not rest on the view that the one is a bigamist in remarrying and the other not. It is based on their previous history, and the inadvisability of allowing the sinner to enjoy the fruit of his sin.

as they stand give to an injured husband the right of divorce and of remarriage.

We are also bound to admit that there is *prima facie* a grave discrepancy between these passages and the parallels from St. Mark and St. Luke. Which version are we to accept? On the old view of Biblical exegesis there could be no question. The fuller and more detailed statement must obviously have precedence over the general and unqualified. 'It is a law of interpretation that a command with a specific qualification is more precise than a general command without any specific qualification; and that the one where the qualification occurs must interpret the other where this qualification does not occur.'[1] On this principle we must accept the version of St. Matthew, it being assumed that the other Evangelists thought it unnecessary to do more than state the command in general terms; on a strict view of inspiration it is easier to excuse an omission than an addition.

But if we follow the methods of modern criticism, this principle no longer holds good. We do not now take it for granted that we have in the Gospels the *ipsissima verba* of Christ. We try to get behind the text to the 'sources,' and test each saying by internal probabilities. The question now assumes a new phase. It is widely held that the exception in the first Gospel *does not represent the actual words of our Lord*, but is either an addition inserted by the editor (possibly found by him in one of the sources he was following), or else an interpolation which very early found its way into the text of the Gospel. This is the Jewish Gospel, and a Jewish community, no less than a Gentile community, would find it very hard to accept so strict a rule as that laid down in St. Mark; practical necessity would lead to some qualification and concession,[2] and it is not difficult to suppose that

It is perfectly logical for the Church or State to say, 'We admit that the bond is broken for both, but we shall not allow the adulterer to take advantage of the fact.'

[1] Gore, *Sermon on the Mount*, p. 71.

[2] Archdeacon Allen in the 'International Critical Commentary' (*St. Matt.* p. 52) suggests that the addition represents 'two influences, viz. Jewish custom and tradition, and the exigencies of ethical necessity in the early Christian Church.'

such a concession might in perfect good faith be added to the text; it being assumed, whether rightly or wrongly, that our Lord did not mean to exclude it. It should be clearly stated that there is no MS. authority for the omission of the words 'except for fornication,' in either passage. It is true that, as has been pointed out already, the text of both is in some disorder, but the confusion is merely of the type we should expect when the saying consists of several short phrases in which there is a good deal of repetition of words and ideas; and when we have *four* Gospel versions of the same *Logion*. There are, however, good critical arguments for the omission of the qualification. Besides its omission in the other two synoptic Gospels, it is omitted by St. Paul in 1 Cor. vii. 10, 11, where he claims to be quoting our Lord's teaching. In St. Matt. v. 32, the words come in very awkwardly and look like a gloss. Comparing the question of the Pharisees as given in St. Mark x. 2 and St. Matt. xix. 3, we find in the latter a significant alteration. In St. Mark the question is absolute, 'Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife?' St. Matthew adds the words 'for every cause.'[1] These words would seem to be *an intentional addition on the part of the editor to prepare the way for the subsequent modification of the prohibition.* And he seems to have left a trace of the original unqualified version in the puzzled question of the disciples in *v.* 10, 'If the case of the man is so with his wife, it is not expedient to marry.' The passage as it stands gives no explanation of this bewilderment on their part; Christ had only taken up the stricter Jewish attitude of Shammai and his school, allowing divorce for unchastity and unchastity alone. No one could have expected Him to take a laxer view, and there had been no 'hard saying' to account for the disciples' remark, which is entirely unexpected. On the other hand, if it originally followed a prohibition of divorce in *any* circumstances, it becomes perfectly intelligible.

There are, therefore, sound critical reasons in both the passages of St. Matthew for holding that they do not represent the original form of our Lord's teaching on divorce.

[1] κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν.

There is on this point a very striking unanimity amongst scholars. Professor Votaw[1] gives a long list of critics who take this view, including Bruce, H. Weiss, H. Holtzmann, Wendt, Schmiedel, Bacon. We may add to it Harnack, Loisy, Salmon, Burkitt, Wright, Allen, Plummer, Montefiore and others. It is a list of names which carries with it great weight, and we may add that it is a conspicuous instance of fairness on the part of the 'higher critics.' We are continually told that they cut about the Bible and the Gospels to suit their prepossessions. It is hardly so in this case, since it is probable that perhaps the majority of these scholars would in fact wish to allow divorce for adultery. Here at least they have applied critical principles impartially, and the fact that they have done so may fairly be counted to them for righteousness, and should lead those who distrust their methods at least to believe more readily in their *bona fides* in other cases. It will, however, be realized that this critical argument is not one which can be light-heartedly adopted by those who do not on other points admit the cogency of the critical method by which it is reached. In fact, we all of us need to be careful that we do not use the 'higher criticism' when it is convenient, and reject it on other occasions. And even those who are justified in adopting this position will feel a certain difficulty in its practical application. In the first place it is quite arguable that though the words in question may be considered to be a primitive gloss, they do none the less represent the spirit of Christ's teaching, and would have been accepted by Him. It should be remembered that a wife's adultery was technically punishable by death, though it seems that the penalty was never enforced in His day. It is therefore possible that He would have considered the marriage *ipso facto* dissolved by the adultery, as it would have been if the offender had been put to death. But even if we prefer the extreme view, and argue that our Lord allowed *no* exception, we can hardly expect our view to be universally accepted. Those who reject it, rest on one

[1] Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, V. p. 27b, note.

version of the words of Christ, as recorded in the New Testament. We ourselves may have good reason to prefer the other version, but we can hardly make its acceptance a matter of conscience. It is clear that those who allow the remarriage of the innocent party after a divorce for adultery have on their side words of the New Testament as they stand, and are following the most reasonable interpretation of those words.[1]

III.

We must pass on to consider the teaching of the rest of the New Testament. The most important passage is 1 Cor. vii., and here again we are faced with a grave difficulty of interpretation in a crucial verse. In verse 10[2] we find, not indeed a quotation from our existing Gospels (that would be an anachronism), but a direct reference to our Lord's teaching. St. Paul may have derived it either from oral tradition or perhaps from 'Q,' one of the two main sources of our Gospels, which as scholars suppose probably existed in a written form before the date of 1 Corinthians. As has already been pointed out, there is no mention of the exception 'except for fornication.' The scope of this passage is rather wider than that of the Gospel passages we have been considering, since it includes not only divorce

[1] It will be remembered that the Lambeth Conference of 1908 accepted the Resolutions of 1888, by which the clergy were 'not instructed to refuse the Sacraments or other privileges of the Church to those who, under civil sanction, are thus married'; a resolution was carried by eighty-seven to eighty-four to the effect that it was undesirable that such marriages should receive the blessing of the Church (*Report*, p. 55). It is important in this connexion to bear in mind that, according to those who have most right to speak on the subject, the really 'innocent party' in a divorce case is not altogether common.

[2] 'But unto the married I give charge—*yea*, not I, but the Lord—that the wife depart not (μὴ χωρισθῆναι) from her husband (but and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or else be reconciled to her husband); and that the husband leave not (μὴ ἀφιέναι) his wife.'

but separation, perhaps partly on the ascetic grounds mentioned earlier in the chapter. The Apostle contemplates the possibility of a separation without remarriage, with the hope of reconciliation. There is no contradiction of what has been said before to the effect that a formal divorce always carried with it the right of remarriage. He forbids separation and *a fortiori* divorce, and definitely sets aside for the Christian the *legal* liberty of contracting a second marriage. Whether in fact he would have admitted the disputed exception 'for adultery' must remain an open question, our answer to which will partly depend on our interpretation of the following verses. It may fairly be argued that the statement of the principle is not such as to exclude any possible qualification.

In the next section the Apostle deals with a fresh case.

'But to the rest say I, not the Lord: If any brother hath an unbelieving wife, and she is content to dwell with him, let him not leave her. And the woman which hath an unbelieving husband, and he is content to dwell with her, let her not leave her husband. For the unbelieving husband is sanctified in the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified in the brother: else were your children unclean; but now are they holy. Yet if the unbelieving departeth, let him depart: *the brother or the sister is not under bondage in such cases*: but God hath called us in peace. For how knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband? or how knowest thou, O husband, whether thou shalt save thy wife?'

We see that the Apostle speaks with some hesitation, feeling that he has here no decisive authority to refer to. The interpretation of the closing words of the passage is doubtful. Is the appeal to 'peace,' and the reference to the possibility of the believing partner 'saving' the unbelieving, introduced as an argument for separation, or for maintaining the marriage? On the whole the latter view is the more probable, but as the verses do not directly affect the question before us, we need not spend time over them. The crucial point is the meaning of the words 'not under bondage'[1] in *v.* 15. Does St. Paul mean 'not bound to live with the

[1] οὐ δεδούλωται.

other,' or ' free to marry again ' ? The question is of the utmost importance both from its direct bearing on the problems of the Mission Field, and from the implications that follow, if St. Paul did in fact allow remarriage in these special circumstances. It has been exhaustively discussed from the former standpoint by Father Puller.[1] He argues that the general sense of the passage is in favour of a permission to remarry. The command of *v.* 11 (' let her remain unmarried ') is not repeated. The opposite of ' bound ' is ' free,' and the analogy of *v.* 39[2] is strongly in favour of freedom to remarry. He mentions modern commentators who take this view, and deals at great length with the evidence of Fathers and Canons, both in East and West. ' So far as I am aware all the evidence is in favour of a right to contract a second marriage, and none is opposed to it.' He points out that the Western Church, which refused divorce *a vinculo* for adultery, permitted it in the case of a mixed marriage. Hence he decides on all grounds in favour of this interpretation. Archdeacon Watkins[3] quotes this pamphlet, and himself comes to the same conclusion.

It would then appear to be probable that St. Paul did mean to allow remarriage, when one of the partners to a heathen marriage had become a Christian, and the marriage had been dissolved on that account. If he did, a most important conclusion seems to follow, however loth we may be to draw it. We can hardly avoid the corollary that he did not regard the marriage tie as being of such a nature that in no circumstances could it be broken during the lifetime of both the partners. It is indeed suggested that we must draw a distinction between Christian and non-Christian marriages, the former being ' sacramental,' the latter merely civil contracts. Of course St. Paul is dealing with the latter,

[1] *Occasional Papers on Missionary Subjects* (Oxford Mission to Calcutta), First Series, No. 8.

[2] ' A wife is *bound* for so long time as her husband liveth, but if her husband be dead she is *free* to be married to whom she will, only in the Lord.' *Cf.* Rom. vii. 3.

[3] *Holy Matrimony*, p. 442.

but there is no hint that he drew the distinction implied. It is indeed impossible to read such a distinction into the New Testament. The Jewish marriage was accompanied by no religious ceremony, and it would be somewhat difficult to prove that any such thing had yet become common among Christians! All the teaching of the New Testament deals with marriage *qua* marriage, quite apart from the particular ceremonies, religious or otherwise, with which it may have been celebrated. No doubt a polygamous or child marriage may be treated as null and void, but a monogamous marriage, made with full consent and consummated, must be regarded as a marriage in the full sense, whether it has been accompanied by a religious service or not. In the words of the Lambeth Conference Committee,[1] 'The Church does not make the marriage. The marriage is made by the man and woman, their consent being duly certified'; the function of the Church is to bear witness to the fact of the marriage, to bless it, and to guard its sanctity. The consequences of any other position would be intolerable. Hence if St. Paul admitted that a legally-contracted heathen marriage could in certain circumstances be dissolved, he implied that the marriage tie was not *per se* indissoluble; it becomes simply a question of analogy, whether there may or may not be corresponding circumstances to justify on the same principles the dissolution of a Christian marriage.

The writer is himself unwilling to draw this conclusion, but he sees no way of escape from it, if we hold that 1 Cor. vii. 15 does in fact allow remarriage. We must, however, remember that this interpretation, however probable, is not certain, and also that the circumstances in St. Paul's mind were of very peculiar difficulty. Later Christian writers help us to realize to some extent the almost intolerable position of a Christian wife in a heathen household; it might very easily become a choice between home and religion, and it is disingenuous to quote the liberty granted by the Apostle as justifying divorce for 'incompatibility of temper.' And even at the cost of repeating what has

[1] *Report*, (1908) p. 140.

already been said, it is well to emphasize the fact that the exception *is* an exception, a deplorable necessity, violating that ideal of the permanence of the marriage tie on which the main stress of the Apostle's teaching is laid.

The other passages of the New Testament which bear on the subject need not detain us for long, not in the least because they are unimportant but because they do not present any special difficulties of interpretation affecting our inquiry. Sins of impurity of every description are continually condemned, and the chief point to remark is the urgent need which was felt for plain speaking on the subject even by writers who were addressing 'the saints' of the primitive Church. The fact that the first Christian Council found it advisable to include 'fornication' among the things to be avoided, and the tone of such a passage as 1 Thess. iv. are significant indications of the general moral condition of the Gentile world. The well-known sections which deal with marriage in Eph. v. and 1 Peter ii. emphasize the sanctity of the marriage tie, but are not decisive as to the possibility of divorce, where the sin of one of the parties has already violated that sanctity. St. Paul's[1] words in Rom. vii. 3 clearly condemn divorce in general. But he only mentions the point incidentally by way of illustration, and his words cannot fairly be pressed to exclude any possible exception.

Comparing the general result of our survey of the New Testament teaching with that of the Old Testament, we find a striking difference. *Now* the whole stress is laid on the general principle of the true nature of the marriage tie, which, though stated in the Old Testament, was there more or less dormant. And the exceptions to the application of that principle have become, at most, very few and very restricted. We are struck by the difficulties raised by the passages. It is often said with truth that our Lord never laid down detailed rules of conduct, but only general principles, leaving these principles to be applied by the

[1] 'If, while the husband liveth, she be joined to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if the husband die, she is free from the law.'

Christian conscience. It is certainly not without significance that in the one apparent exception, in His teaching about divorce and its conditions, so much uncertainty attends His words. This significance becomes accentuated when we remember that there is a similar doubt of the right interpretation of so many other passages of the Bible which deal with the *details* of marriage law. We may instance not only the passages we have been considering, but such things as the position of polygamy, the prohibited degrees, or the injunction that the 'bishops' must be 'the husband of one wife.' We shall speak later on of the conclusions we may draw from this uncertainty; it will be sufficient now to call attention to the fact.

IV.

In the evidence given before the Royal Commission, a good deal is being said on the question how far the wife should be on an equality with the husband in the matter of divorce. It may be well briefly to examine the Biblical attitude on this point. It is clear that the position usually assumed both in the Old and New Testaments is hardly of a character to satisfy the advocates of 'women's rights'—if they be 'rights' in this matter. In a much-canvassed article in a recent number of the *Hibbert Journal*, it was brought as an accusation against our Lord that He ignored the woman's side of the question. Many answers have been made to this; we may quote our Jewish commentator [1] as an impartial witness. 'We shall cherish his championship of womanhood. He does seem to have felt that woman had been hardly dealt with, and that she should not be treated more harshly than man.'

But the same writer [2] has some hard things to say of the general Jewish attitude in this respect. 'The religious position of women and the law of divorce form the least attractive feature in the Rabbinical system. . . . Of all weak spots and sore places this was the weakest and sorest.'

[1] Montefiore, *Synoptic Gospels*, i. p. 242. [2] *Ibid.* p. 235.

It must in fairness be remembered that the Jew can claim the support of the Old Testament and to some extent of the New, though in the latter we find principles which in the end spell emancipation. The Old Testament condemns adultery on the part of a man as a moral offence, but it is not punishable as an injury to the wife in the same way that her adultery is punished as an injury to him. The wife belongs to her husband (her *Baal* or lord); she is not even the chief of his chattels in the Tenth Commandment; unchastity on her part is a breach of his rights; she has no concern with his fidelity. If he commits adultery with a married (or betrothed) woman, it is indeed an offence, but only against the husband of his paramour. Intercourse with an unmarried woman is not 'adultery.'[1] Hence in Jewish law the wife had no power of divorce, though we find the germ of the right in Exod. xxi. 11. It is true that as time went on the harshness of this position was to some extent modified in practice; the injured wife could not apply for a divorce, but she could move the court to compel her husband himself to grant her a *get*. And we have the delightful decree of Rabbi ben Gershon in the eleventh century[2]: 'To assimilate the right of the woman to the right of the man, it is decreed that even as the man does not put away his wife except of his own free will, so shall the woman not be put away except by her own consent.' In the Greek and Roman world women had more freedom in this respect, and the foreign custom was imitated by Hellenizing ladies of position, such as Salome[3] or Herodias,[4] but it is strongly condemned by Josephus as an innovation.

When we turn to the Gospels we find that neither in the first nor the third is the possibility of divorce by the wife contemplated. But in St. Mark x. 12 we read, 'And if a woman shall put away her husband and marry another, she committeth adultery.' The conception was so alien to Jewish law that it caused trouble to early, no less than

[1] *Jewish Encyclopedia, s.v.* 'Divorce.' [2] *Ibid.*
[3] Jos. *Ant. Jud.* XV. vii. 10. [4] *Ibid.* XVIII. v. 4.

to modern, critics. The reading of Codex Bezae[1] may serve as an illustration of the one; to represent the other we may quote the words of M. Loisy,[2] who holds that Mark has modified the original formula by the introduction of divorce on the part of the wife, 'pour l'adapter plus exactement aux mœurs de la société où vivaient ses premiers lecteurs,' *i.e.* the Graeco-Roman world. But Professor Burkitt, whose interesting view of the setting of the incident we have already quoted, defends verse 12:

'I venture to think . . . that so far from being a secondary addition it is one of the really primitive features of the Gospel of Mark, a feature which was dropped out or altered when its historical meaning had been forgotten. It was no doubt monstrous to imagine that a Jewess should desert her husband to marry another man, but it was not quite unheard of. We know the woman and her history. . . . The saying as reported in Mark clearly implies a reference to Herodias, a reference which is singularly appropriate in the time and place.'[3]

The point is perhaps interesting rather than important, since according to St. Mark there is no *liberty* granted to the woman; a restriction is laid upon her. But it tends to shew that our Lord regarded husband and wife as being on the same terms, and that *if* He allowed any liberty of divorce to the husband, as in St. Matthew's Gospel, He would probably have granted a corresponding liberty to the wife. It is indeed hard to see how it could be refused on Christian principles, though it need not necessarily be granted under precisely the same conditions. But, after all, woman's true charter is not liberty of divorce, but the sanctity of the home and the inviolability of the marriage tie. Christ's real gift to her was the establishment of these principles, which have in fact become the means of her emancipation. If the wife

[1] καὶ ἐὰν γυνὴ ἐξελθῇ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς καὶ ἄλλον γαμήσῃ (If a woman *depart* from her husband, etc.); the technical term for divorce used in the ordinary text is thus avoided. The Old Syriac version has the same reading, but puts the woman's case first, transposing verses 11 and 12; *cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 10–13.

[2] *Les Évangiles Synoptiques*, ii. p. 199.

[3] *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 100.

is not the mere chattel of her husband, to be discarded by him at his whim, but his lifelong partner, it follows at once that there is essentially a real equality between the two.

On this point also we may call attention to the absence of any detailed legislation. There is no 'programme of women's rights,' no direct interference with existing social conditions. Principles are stated which are to be applied slowly as they come to be understood and as society is gradually prepared to assimilate them. We know that this is what happened in the crucial instance of slavery. The elevation of woman has moved on parallel lines. Whether it is yet complete is a question we need not discuss here.

By St. Paul the woman is, as we know, usually treated as the subordinate of the man (*e.g.* 1 Cor. xi.); he never quite shook off the effects of his Jewish training. But in 1 Cor. vii., whatever liberty he gives to the man he gives to the woman as well, and in sayings such as that of Gal. iii. 28 there is the germ of a real equality. And in view of suggestions bluntly put forward before the Royal Commission, it should be said decisively that there is in the New Testament no shred of support for the attitude of the man of the world, who considers a 'slip' on the part of the husband a comparatively venial offence. A Sir Austin Feverel may be quick to reassure his son with his 'vast is the distinction between women and men in this one sin,' and may support it 'with physical and moral citations.' We appeal to such a passage as 1 Cor. vi. There is nothing there of the old view that adultery is mainly an injury to another man's property. Unchastity of every description is a sin against the Holy Ghost of Whom our bodies are the temple. And in 1 Thess. iv., where the idea of a wrong done to the neighbour appears, the main stress is laid on the inherent sinfulness of the impure act. Of course it is true that from the social point of view sin on the man's part has not the same disastrous consequences in bringing confusion into the family; it is no doubt a matter for the legislature to decide whether it is to be punished in the same way as unfaithfulness in the wife, and at what point it should become a ground for divorce. But to those who follow the teaching of the New

Testament it is sin always and everywhere, to be condoned by no sort of worldly sophistry.

V.

The conclusions, or lack of conclusions, in this survey will no doubt seem to many disappointing. We like a man to know his own mind and to give a decided answer, even if it be a wrong one. But the question is, do our *data* admit of such an answer? If they do not, it is both more honest and more scientific to admit it quite frankly. We must face the fact that there are passages in the Bible where, from the nature of the case, we must abandon any hope of a final and certain explanation. All writers at times express themselves so imperfectly that the only sure way of arriving at their meaning is to ask them themselves. St. Paul, it would seem, did so in 1 Cor. vii., and unhappily we can no longer refer the point to him. We must therefore be content to remain in ignorance of what he really meant. It is quite conceivable that he had not decided whether he would allow remarriage or not, and used language intentionally vague, or else that this particular point was not in his mind at the moment. And with regard to the Gospel passages, what we have is discordant, more or less contemporary, versions of the same saying; the original is lost beyond recall. In both cases we can reach a probability, but never anything more.

The point to be emphasized is that this uncertainty is final, and must become an integral factor in our calculations. A perfectly definite result emerges. We have a fresh confirmation of the conviction to which we are tending on so many other grounds, that we are not meant to appeal to Scripture for detailed rules of conduct. Our modern view of inspiration discourages such a procedure; the ambiguity of the texts makes it impossible. May we not see a providence in this very ambiguity, a warning against resting on the letter that killeth? The Christian conscience, corporate no less than individual, must be prepared to act on its own responsibility, asking for, and expecting to receive, the aid of the Spirit Who is to guide it into all truth.

But though we abandon the attempt to extract a cast-iron code from Scripture, we look for principles, and for some indication of the spirit in which those principles are to be applied. And as we have seen so often, there is no shade of uncertainty about the paramount importance of the general principle of the sanctity of marriage, and of the ideal at which Church, State, and the individual are all bound to aim. The whole point at issue is whether the pressure of circumstances is to allow any modifications of that ideal. May Christians in their legislation still make allowance for 'the hardness of men's hearts,' as Moses did? Our examination of the New Testament has shewn that any concessions can at the most be only very few, very restricted, and very clearly defined. There is no sort of support for anything approaching the 'American' system. But, holding strongly and enthusiastically, as we do, to the Christian ideal of the permanence of the marriage tie, it would yet seem over-bold to deny the possibility of any exceptions. Christ may have allowed one; St. Paul probably did; an important section of the early Church certainly did, as we see from the text of the first Gospel. The Eastern branch of the Church, whether wisely or not, has never been very strict; the Western Church has been strict in theory, but not in practice. As Bishop Creighton was fond of pointing out, the apparent rigidity of the Canon Law was freely modified by numerous 'legal fictions,' and by the system of dispensations. Just because of our own firm belief in the importance of the general principle, there is a real danger of the Church of England allowing itself on this and other matters to take up a more uncompromising and impracticable position than any other Branch. At least we have no right to make it a case of conscience when the State allows divorce for adultery. And remembering the interpretation of 1 Cor. vii. 15, *which has the sanction of ecclesiastical tradition and law*, it is difficult to hold that divorce for any other reason but adultery is necessarily and certainly unscriptural. The writer speaks only for himself, but he feels that unless we are prepared to say that St. Paul made a grave error, and was, in fact, contradicting the teaching of Christ, we must not be too severe in

criticizing those who would extend the analogy to a very few, special, and carefully defined cases, where the circumstances are parallel to those supposed by the Apostle. Whether, in fact, any such extension is expedient is a matter for the gravest consideration. We may accept *ex animo* the words in which the Committee of the last Lambeth Conference, appointed to consider Marriage Problems, sum up their Report: 'We earnestly invite all Churches to unite in withstanding the prevailing flood of laxity of practice and thought in all matters affecting marriage. To do so with real effect our rebuke must be firm and strong; but strong it cannot be unless it is also measured.' We can hardly expect it to be regarded as 'measured,' if we attempt to 'go beyond the things that are written.'

One word in conclusion, since a wrong emphasis may be given, if we even appear to end with the condonation of the exception. Divorce is always a bad thing. The utmost of our contention would be that the New Testament does just permit it under certain conditions in order to avoid worse evils; permits it, nothing more. It is always a falling away from the ideal and comes of evil. These words recall an analogy which may help us. Our Lord forbids oaths as superfluous for members of the Kingdom, yet the Church has always tolerated them, because men's simple word cannot yet be always trusted. In the same way, on account of the weakness of human nature, we may tolerate some modification of the absolute rule against divorce. But we remember that though the novelist may invent his 'hard cases' without limit, the real proportion of these cases in actual life is small. The happiness of the greatest number, and very often in the end, of the individual affected, is not increased by licence but by strictness. The ultimate end which all legislation should keep before it is the gradual realization of the ideal, not an increasing liberty to drift further and further away from it. And the Christian will, as a member of the Kingdom, seek for himself no exemption from its laws.

C. W. Emmet.

SHORT NOTICES.

I.—Biblical Studies.

1. *Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary.* Edited by the Rev. W. C. Piercy, M.A., Dean and Chaplain of Whitelands College. With Coloured Maps and 365 Illustrations. (John Murray. 1908.) 21*s.* net.
2. *Dictionary of the Bible.* Edited by J. Hastings, D.D., with the co-operation of J. A. Selbie, D.D., and with the assistance of J. C. Lambert, D.D., and of Shailer Mathews, D.D., Professor of Theology and Dean of the Divinity School in the University of Chicago. (T. and T. Clark. 1909.) 20*s.* net.
3. *The Temple Dictionary of the Bible.* Written and edited by the Rev. W. Ewing, M.A., formerly of Tiberias, Palestine, and the Rev. J. E. H. Thomson, D.D., formerly of Safed, Palestine, and other Scholars and Divines. With 500 Illustrations. (J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd. 1910.) 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

It is no easy task for the reviewer to keep pace with the succession of dictionaries provided by the ingenuity of editors and the enterprise of publishers. So far as these works are indicative of an increasing interest in the study of the Bible in the light of modern knowledge—and the production of a dictionary involves so heavy an expenditure that it may fairly be assumed that this is the case—they are cordially to be welcomed. But a somewhat prolonged study of such volumes raises a little doubt as to the effect upon the student of the consumption of such intellectual pemmican as is often set before him.

We will take the volume edited by Mr. Piercy first. It is not entirely a new book (though no indication of the fact seems to be given), being based apparently upon a Dictionary originally edited by the late Sir William Smith, to whose labours past generations of students have owed much. It contains some articles (those on the 'Text of the New Testament' and on 'Versions' may be mentioned as instances) which would do credit to any dictionary, whatever its size, and a number of others which, if a little cramped by lack of space. are not unworthy of the reputation of the writers. Dr. Orr's views on the Pentateuch will not now command general assent, but no one need quarrel with the spirit and method in which they are set forth. The article on the Canon of the New Testament is

avowedly a condensation of Bishop Westcott's study in the large edition of Smith's *Dictionary* (4 vols. 1893): we make no complaint of this; but we have a right to protest when we find tacked on to it, as 'referring to the discussions since Bishop Westcott's time,' an additional half-column which is alike unscholarly and inept. The geographical and topographical articles are chiefly due to the late Colonel Conder, though that on Jerusalem was written by the late Sir Charles Wilson, a brother member of that scholarly band of military pioneers of Palestine exploration of which Lord Kitchener is now, we believe, one of the few survivors. Many of these articles are admirably illustrated; indeed, the illustrations and the excellence of the printing are two of the most marked features of the volume, which otherwise suffers a little in comparison with the others from being rather heavy and cumbrous to hold.

Dr. Hastings' Dictionary, in the form in which we have it before us, contains maps but no illustrations. It is printed in slightly smaller but quite legible type, and includes articles under a larger number of headings. Opinions may differ as to the relative merits of those small articles on names of persons, places, things, etc., of which little is known and which form the common stock of all Bible dictionaries, though the balance seems on the whole slightly in favour of Mr. Piercy's work. But, with some exceptions, the other shews a clearly marked superiority in the longer articles. It may be true that the one volume probably contains fewer conclusions with which readers will disagree, but, after all, in difficult questions the use of a dictionary is not to obtain opinions ready-made but to find a clear statement of what the problems are, and as full an illustration as space permits of the way in which scholars have endeavoured to deal with them. To take an instance as far removed as possible from doctrinal controversy: To the writer on the 'Chronology of the New Testament' in Mr. Piercy's book, the fact that there *are* problems of considerable difficulty and importance is apparently unknown, whereas the Bishop of Moray's treatment of them in Dr. Hastings' Dictionary extends to ten columns full of interest. There are many other articles to which attention might be called, if space permitted, but we can only mention one. We do not know anywhere so admirable a summary account of the English Versions of the Bible as the twenty-one columns devoted to them here. No student of sufficient ability and knowledge to use the book will ever regret the pound which it cost him.

The publishers of the *Temple Bible Dictionary* have produced a remarkably cheap book of 1072 well-printed pages with maps and 500 illustrations. The editors have also, if we may venture to say so, incidentally added a new terror to the difficulties which beset the young or unprofessional student by the introduction of an elaborate system of contractions. Mercifully they have not been consistent in their practice, and such gems as 'a hierarchy of sptl. beings to wh. man by prop. means mt. approach,' 'bldg. in anct. Egp. Pal. and . . . ,' 'there are no corrspdg. refcs. fm. profane hist.,' do not distinguish all the articles. The general plan of the book contains some original features. It opens with articles of rather unequal merit on subjects connected with the study of the Bible, the English Bible, Apocrypha of the N.T., Targums, Versions, sketches of Philo and Josephus, and a study of the Language of Palestine in the time of our Lord. It is the only modern dictionary we have seen which treats the 'Apocrypha' proper as entirely distinct from the Canonical Scriptures, and groups all headings referring to it in a separate alphabetical list, forming the last seventy pages of the book. Of the execution of the work it is a little difficult to speak. To 'the Local Preacher, the Class leader, and the Sunday School teacher,' who are included with 'the Working Clergyman' among those whose needs have been steadily kept in view, parts of it will probably be rather bewildering. Highly concentrated extract of 'kge' (Templar for 'knowledge'), farced with a copious store of Hebrew and Greek words, even though transliterated, is strong meat for such readers. At the same time the *Dictionary* contains a large amount of matter to which this objection does not apply. Some of the articles are on quite an extensive scale, *e.g.* Prof. Dalman's study of Jerusalem extends to more than eighteen columns. We may add that the writers have the merit of being conspicuously fair in nearly every case in the representation of views which they are unable to accept, and of recognizing frankly the existence of problems and difficulties which call for solution.

Histoire du Canon de l'Ancien Testament dans l'Église Grecque et l'Église Russe. Par M. Jugie, des Augustins de l'Assomption. (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne et Cie. 1909.) 1 *fr.* 50.

This is substantially a reprint of four articles which appeared in the *Écho d'Orient* during 1907. M. Jugie attacks the Greek

and Roman Churches for unsoundness with regard to the Deutero-canonical writings; but he gives us something more than a mere controversial tract. Beginning with the Council *in Trullo* (692), which was the first Eastern Council repudiated by the Roman Church, he traces up to the present time the history of the Old Testament Canon in the 'Orthodox' Church. It was true to its name up to the Reformation period, when Lutheran, Calvinist, and Anglican ideas, spreading eastward, led many Greek theologians to take a non-Roman view as to the inspiration and authority of the Apocrypha. Cyril Lucar, to whom we owe the priceless gift of the *Codex Alexandrinus* now in the British Museum, comes in naturally for a good deal of censure. At the present day there seems to be an extraordinary difference of opinion among the Greek clergy as to the authority of the Apocrypha. In one school the pupils are taught that the entire Septuagint is the inspired Word of God, while in another school close by the teaching represents precisely the position of the Church of England as stated in Article VI. Yet different Catechisms equally sanctioned by the Holy Synod are available to support both.

In the Russian Church the trend of thought ever since the days of Peter the Great has been favourable to the Reformers' view, and the denial of inspiration to the Deutero-canonical Books has now become practically a dogma. There is nothing on the score of the Canon, M. Jugie remarks, to hinder the union of the Churches of England and Russia.

The author's style is clear, vivacious, and free from bitterness. His references to our Church, to the Non-jurors, to the British and Foreign Bible Society, and other matters, have special interest for readers in England; and the book is well worth attentive perusal by all who feel the importance of the Apocrypha and our attitude thereto.

The Dates of Genesis. A Comparison of the Biblical Chronology with that of other Ancient Nations. With an Appendix on Chronological Astronomy. By F. A. Jones. (London: The Kingsgate Press. 1909.) 5*s.* net.

We gladly credit Mr. Jones with rather more than a smattering of Astronomy and Archaeology and a turn for Long Tots, if only because he has put together some curious information, and sets it forth with courtesy for his opponents—a rare feature of books such as this. But he attempts the impossible when

he tries to defend the substantial accuracy of Ussher's famous time-table. We know quite certainly now that the earth is vastly older than the worthy Archbishop of Armagh imagined when he set the pendulum of history swinging first at the year 4004 B.C. Mr. Jones moves with ease and assurance amidst the events of the antediluvian world, but he will scarcely find modern readers inclined to accompany him.

Biblical Criticism and Modern Thought, or The Place of the Old Testament Documents in the Life of To-day. By W. G. JORDAN, D.D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis in Queen's University, Kingston, Canada. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1909.) 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Modern Study of the Old Testament and Inspiration. By T. H. SPROTT, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Wellington, N. Z. (Cambridge University Press. 1909.) 3*s.* net.

THESE books deserve a hearty welcome from all who care to know how Biblical studies are progressing in Greater Britain. They give the results of modern criticism clearly, and the writers maintain throughout a reverent sense of the dignity of their theme. The Canadian Professor deals effectively with certain present-day objections to the critical view, especially those urged by writers like Professor Sayce and Dr. Orr. The New Zealand clergyman has an attractive style, and his book should win success. Here and there we could wish for rather more of such guarded statement as characterizes Dr. Jordan's book. For example, Mr. Sprott lacks precision in what he says about the name Jehovah. It is misleading to say (p. 144) that *Jahaveh* (i.e. *Yahăweh*) 'is simply the third person singular of the verb,' whose first person is the 'I will be' of Exodus iii. 14. The Hebrew for 'He will be' is *Yihyeh*. The form *Yahăweh* never occurs. If it did, it would not come from the proper word for 'to be' (*hāyāh*), but from a most rare form of that verb (*hāwāh*). And further, many scholars parse the tetragrammaton as a Hiph'il. The word would thus be pronounced *Yahweh* or *Jahveh*, 'He will cause to be.'

On another point we need not more but less precision. It is a little over-bold to assume that the Hebrew primitive belief in survival after death was 'killed by Ethical Monotheism' (p. 157), and that the prophets deliberately threw overboard this belief along with all the paraphernalia of heathen theology. A slightly less dogmatic tone would be suited for such a discussion. But this is not representative of the book as a whole;

and all who are interested in the Old Testament may find pleasure and profit in Mr. Sprott's treatise as well as in that of Professor Jordan.

The Bible and the British Museum. By ADA R. HABERSHON. With a Preface by Sir ROBERT ANDERSON, K.C.B., LL.D. (London: Morgan and Scott. 1909.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

A BRIEF extract will indicate the method of Biblical interpretation followed in this production. The discovery that the village of Hillah, near the site of Babylon, is built with bricks bearing the name of Nebuchadnezzar

'is a proof that the actual city of Babylon is to be rebuilt, for the prophecies concerning the destruction of Babylon have not yet been fulfilled, viz., it is to be destroyed by fire from heaven, as Sodom and Gomorrah; no Arab is to pitch his tent there after its destruction; and "They shall not take of thee a stone for a corner, nor a stone for foundations."'

It is in keeping with this that modern critics—representing the great Christian universities of the world—are all through the book regarded as unprincipled schemers banded together to dethrone and destroy the Bible.

And yet Sir Robert Anderson, who anticipates the appearance of some book that shall thoroughly discredit the work of the critics, thinks that 'the present volume marks out the lines on which that *magnum opus* will be framed'!

Israel's Hope of Immortality. Four Lectures. By the Rev. C. F. BURNEY, M.A., D.Litt., Fellow and Lecturer in Hebrew of St. John Baptist College, Oxford. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1909.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

DR. BURNEY'S Vacation Lectures at Durham in 1906 have already appeared in *The Interpreter*; but they well deserved publication in book form. Most of the relevant passages of Scripture are duly noticed. We miss, however, any reference to Eccles. xii. 7 ('Then shall the spirit return to God'). Surely this passage may possibly be part of Qoheleth's own work, and not an interpolation. Again, the doctrine of Pre-existence is barely named, and then only in a quotation from Dr. Charles. But within the limits Dr. Burney set himself he has done his work admirably; and the book should prove very helpful and suggestive to students and to preachers.

A Hebrew word on p. 40 is misprinted (*qirbām*).

A Short Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament. By the Rev. G. H. Box, M.A., sometime Hebrew Master at Merchant Taylor's, Vicar of Linton, Ross. 'Oxford Church Text Books.' (Rivingtons. 1909.) 1s. net.

STUDENTS at work on the Canon, or on Textual Criticism, or even on the intricacies of Hebrew Poetry, as well as on any single scripture from Genesis to Malachi, will here find guidance given them by a first-rate scholar apt to teach. We heartily commend this book, not only as an introduction to larger works, but as giving to students of such works a clear and convenient summary of results. And accustomed as we are nowadays to cheap publication, this little volume appears to be an extraordinarily good shillingsworth.

The Commentary of Pelagius on the Epistles of Paul: The Problem of its Restoration. By ALEXANDER SOUTER, D.LITT., Yates Professor of New Testament Greek and Exegesis, Mansfield College, Oxford. *Proceedings of the British Academy*, Vol. II. (Henry Frowde.)

PELAGIUS' commentary on St. Paul's Epistles was published at Rome about 410 A.D., and is quoted not long afterwards by Augustine, Marius Mercator, and—more in paraphrase—by the so-called Praedestinatus; hence, Dr. Souter argues, 'if any commentary survives in which all of these [citations] appear, it is to be regarded as a form of the commentary of Pelagius' (p. 5). Such a 'pure Pelagius' commentary he believes that he has found in MS. No. cxix. of the Reichenau collection at Karlsruhe, which he has collated, and an edition of which is promised in *Texts and Studies*. The date of this MS. is probably the earlier half of the ninth century, and 'the correctness of the orthography and the extreme purity of the text' point to a 'high antiquity for the original' (p. 15), viz. probably the fifth century, 'the very century in which Pelagius wrote' (p. 16). Moreover, 'It is the shortest of all commentaries which have any claim to be considered Pelagius' . . . it is uniform throughout: it has no additional comments . . . but it has plenty of alternative explanations . . . it is without interpolation of any sort. It contains all the quotations in Augustine and Mercator . . . it has the text in by far the purest form' (p. 16). Apart from the natural interest in Dr. Souter's recovery of the 'earliest British book,' a highly important additional result, if Dr. Souter's case be

sound—and we have no reason to question this—is that the Karlsruhe MS. provides us with a document which is 'of the highest value for constituting the Vulgate text of St. Paul's Epistles' (p. 17), since it takes us back to 410 A.D.—'within thirty years of the original publication of the Vulgate itself' (p. 18). If this be so, then undoubtedly the MS. is even more valuable from this side than as being the pure commentary of Pelagius himself, interesting and important as this is.

For a discussion of the complex questions concerning the pseudo-Jerome and pseudo-Primasius commentaries we must refer back to Dr. Souter's able and closely knit argument. The main interest of the paper, of course, centres in his identification of the Karlsruhe MS. with the original Pelagius commentary.

II.—Philosophy of Religion and Apologetics.

Philosophy and Religion. Six Lectures delivered at Cambridge. By Hastings Rashdall, D.Litt., Fellow and Tutor of New College, Oxford. (Duckworth. 1909.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

We are glad that Dr. Rashdall has published these lectures. There is not very much in them which will be new to those who are familiar with his earlier writings, though we would draw special attention to the criticism of Dr. McTaggart's position. What we here find is the views already expressed by Dr. Rashdall in his *Theory of Good and Evil*, and in scattered Essays, shortly and clearly restated in a form most useful for those who have not time to study the larger books. Dr. Rashdall is a pronounced intellectualist. He has no sympathy, as he tells us, with the attempt to base religion upon anything but honest inquiry into truth; that a theory defies all intellectual grasp is, he thinks, a sufficient reason for its rejection; and though he holds that our perception of moral truth is immediate, he believes that our faith in God rests upon inference only. The argument in the lectures is just what we should expect from this standpoint. We are led to belief in God primarily through an idealistic philosophy. Since the world exists only for intelligence, and certainly does not exist only for our individual intelligence, there must be a universal mind in which and for which all exists; and since events must have a cause, and we know of no cause but will, we are led to trace the systematic unity of nature to one will, and to think of God as possessing, though no doubt in some higher form than our own, feeling and will as well as

thought. In a similar way we are led to our belief in the character of God by the demands of our moral consciousness. Our moral judgements are immediate judgements of reason, and, if we are to believe that the moral law has any true reality, we must conceive of it as existing in the Divine consciousness. In connexion with this argument, Dr. Rashdall well criticizes the conception of a 'super-moral' Deity.

The last two lectures are, we think, less valuable than the earlier. The unique position of Christianity among the historical religions is, Dr. Rashdall thinks, due to the fact that it alone combines an ethical ideal which appeals to the universal conscience with a Theism which commends itself to Reason. This is of course just what Dr. Rashdall demands of religion—this, and nothing more—and the natural result is that the vast tracts of Christian truth which go beyond this fail to appeal to him. If his teaching about the Person of our Lord, or about His Resurrection, is unsatisfactory, that is because, regarding our Lord almost exclusively as a Teacher and example, he has no use for the full Catholic faith upon these subjects. What we feel, here as elsewhere, about Dr. Rashdall is that he does not know what the deeper experiences of sin and of redemption are to those who are the subjects of them, and so criticizes orthodox Christianity from the standpoint of his own needs and not from the standpoint of the needs of the world. We think that there are many roads to the Kingdom of God beside the intellectualist road which he would have us tread, and much to be seen when we reach it beside what he sees; but that does not destroy our gratitude to him for the clearness and force with which he has mapped out for us the road which he himself has trodden.

Faith and its Psychology. By W. R. Inge, D.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. (Duckworth. 1909.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Dr. Inge is the despair of the reviewer. His books are delightful to read. There is much valuable criticism; there are many valuable quotations—we would instance the statement of Professor Royce on p. 238 as to the meaning he attaches to the term 'God'; there are *obiter dicta* on many subjects which are extremely interesting; but, somehow, Dr. Inge does not answer the questions which we want to put to him, and, though we frequently

seem to be approaching an understanding of his own position, we do not find that we really arrive at it.

Dr. Inge tells us that 'the main objects of this volume are threefold. Firstly, to vindicate for religious Faith its true dignity as a normal and healthy part of human nature. Next, to insist that Faith demands the actual reality of its objects, and can never be content with a God who is only an ideal. Lastly, to show in detail how most of the errors and defects in religious belief have been due to a tendency to arrest the development of Faith prematurely, by annexing it to some one faculty to the exclusion of others, or by resting on given authority.' It is, we think, the third of these objects which the book best attains. Dr. Inge maintains, with the best Christian thinkers, that faith is 'a basal energy of the whole man'; it is 'something deeper, more universal, more fundamental, than anything that can be assigned to the independent activities of the intellect, will or feelings.' It 'arises in the psychological necessity which obliges us to assign values to our experience.' 'There are three attributes of things which have an absolute intrinsic value,' truth, moral goodness, and beauty—it is, we think, characteristic of Dr. Inge to place them in this order—and these three schemes of value cannot be reduced to each other. 'Faith assures us that truth, goodness, and beauty, which are attributes of the eternal order, are also attributes of the world of existence, so that in living for and in these eternal ideas, so far as we can do so here, we are living in accordance with the fundamental laws of the world in which we are placed.'

With this as his own position, Dr. Inge finds a wide field for criticism. He deals in turn with those who, like Schleiermacher, would identify faith with pure feeling, with those who rest upon external authority, with those who, like the Pragmatists and the Modernists, depreciate the intellect in comparison with the will, and with the intellectualists, who would have us rest our faith upon demonstration. He is most successful, we think, in dealing with the first and fourth of these classes, just because it is with the emotional and intellectual aspects of faith that he has himself most sympathy. But chapters V–VIII, which deal with authority as a ground of faith, are both fair and valuable. What he maintains is that, whether we are inclined to rest upon a supposed infallible Church, or infallible book, or infallible teacher, or even, like the Ritschlians, upon the records of our Lord's Galilean ministry,

Divine authority cannot be independent of the response which our personality makes to the true, the good, and the beautiful.

Where, we think, Dr. Inge is least successful is in dealing with those who are disposed to depreciate the intellect in comparison with the will. We think, for example, that the late Father Tyrrell's position was less unlike his own than he supposes. Dr. Inge himself says that truth determines desire, 'and makes itself known through creed as desire'; he says also that 'our sense of beauty is an imaginative representation which connects our present experience with the eternal,' and explains in a footnote that 'imaginative' is not the same as 'purely subjective,' since there may be an essential connexion between the image and reality. Now, when Father Tyrrell maintains that 'the universally proved value of the creed as a practical guide' assures us that the doctrines it enshrines are a true, though no doubt inadequate, representation of eternal truth, he maintains a similar position. He does not really exclude judgements of being from any part in the determination of religious faith; on the contrary, our needs must be founded on the real constitution of the world; what he denies is simply that these judgements of being are statements upon the same plane as statements about facts of science and of history. Dr. Inge does not refute this position. However great his own sympathy may be with those who 'instead of explaining nature from the being of man . . . seek to understand human life from the general laws of nature,' he has no philosophical defence to offer for them; that the intellect, which he regards as the finest instrument we have, is an instrument slowly fashioned to deal with the material world, and therefore likely to prove misleading when we pass beyond it, is not a theory, but a fact—we wish that Bergson found a place in Dr. Inge's Bibliography;—and while Dr. Inge admits that the faculties of our mind must be really unified before faith can fully come into its own, and that this cannot be yet, he must himself be content with the twilight in which Tyrrell walked. But our main criticism upon the book must be this. Dr. Inge, like those whom he criticizes, himself 'arrests the development of faith prematurely,' and that not by annexing it to some one faculty but by studying the working of our faculties in the abstract, instead of studying them as they have responded and do respond to the appeal which the Person of Christ and the witness of His Church make to them all. We do not forget the true homage to our Lord which we find upon p. 126, or the frank recognition of the value of Church authority which we find

upon p. 106, but we are quite sure that the place of the historic Christ, and of the historic Church, in the development of human faith, has been a greater one than Dr. Inge's book at all recognizes.

The Venture of Rational Faith. By MARGARET BENSON. (Macmillan and Co. 1908.) 6s. net.

THE title of this book well indicates the standpoint from which Miss Benson writes. Faith no doubt involves a venture, but the venture must be rational; and what Miss Benson has sought to do is 'to examine the basis on which belief actually rests or may rest, in order to find what reason is implied in it.' Miss Benson has evidently read widely and thought both deeply and accurately. At times she reminds us of Bishop Butler in her cautiousness of statement, and in her continual recollection of the objections which may be urged against the positions she adopts. Many, we can but think, who are irritated rather than helped by ordinary books of Christian Evidences, ought to find here the help which they require. The book falls into four divisions. Firstly, we have an Introduction, distinguishing various forms of rational belief, and shewing on the ordinary idealist lines the impossibility of philosophic materialism. Secondly, we have an examination of the chief difficulties in the way of belief in Christianity, those, that is, from the sides of science and of history, and from the parallels which exist between Christianity and other religions. Here we do not find very much that is new, though we think Miss Benson brings out particularly well that the judgements which we form about historical records imply psychological, ethical, and spiritual judgements, and that historical evidence is not necessarily valueless because it is not demonstrative. In the third or 'Constructive' division of the book, we have 'an examination of the reasons for faith' which are 'implied in any reality of rational life.' It is here, we think, that Miss Benson has most to teach. The chief stress is laid upon our possession of moral ideals, and our consciousness of moral obligation. If we take a moral view of the world at all, we must assume 'a soul of the universe on an infinite scale, making towards ends, shaping purposes according to laws of righteousness, perfection and love.' Our 'ideals on the one side, and the facts of the material universe on the other, can only conceivably be harmonized by some religious theory.' But Miss Benson carries the argument further

than this. She points out that for the actualization of morality we must assume not merely God, the soul, and immortality, but the existence of power to fulfil the moral law, and in an admirable chapter she shews us how the spiritual experience of the saints assures us that the redeeming power we demand is actually given to us. The last part of the book shews the way in which Christianity corresponds to the demands which our nature makes, especially in its three doctrines of the Fatherhood of God, of the Sacrifice of Christ, and of the Spirit in the Church. We can but wish that Miss Benson had developed this more fully than she has actually done, and especially that the argument which arises from the correspondence of Christianity to the needs of men had been treated on rather more comprehensive lines. If the book has a weakness, it is that it is insufficiently constructive. Powerful as its arguments are in themselves, and well as they are stated and illustrated, it nevertheless, we think, fails to leave a strong and clear impression upon the mind, just because Miss Benson, in her Butler-like anxiety to bear in mind every possible objection, seems to leave herself insufficient time to drive home her constructive points. Even that part of her book which she entitles 'Constructive' is really very largely occupied with answers to objections. We do not know of any book which shews better how little reason there is why we should not be Christians; what we desire is to be shewn a little more fully why we should be.

History, Authority and Theology. By A. C. Headlam, D.D. Principal of King's College, London. (John Murray. 1909.) 6*s.* net.

These essays are, Dr. Headlam tells us, 'fragments of larger works which' he 'had hoped to carry out, if the continuous strain of practical occupations had permitted.' The first, or 'Introductory' essay, is a statement of the Christian position in relation to historical criticism, science, and philosophy, such as might be put into the hands of any intelligent man who is troubled about the relation of the faith to modern knowledge. It insists, and this insistence is very necessary to-day, upon both the value and the solidity of the historical foundations of Christianity. Dr. Headlam thinks that the tendency to disparage them arises in part from lack of imagination. The creation of the Christian Church is inexplicable unless the Christ of the Gospels was an historical reality. In a similar way, he argues in a later

essay that the Epistles of the Apostolic Fathers are inexplicable unless there existed before them a Christian literature similar to that contained in the Canon. The second essay—that on 'The Sources and Authority of Dogmatic Theology'—to some extent goes over the same ground as the first, though it also goes beyond it. If anyone thinks that the day for systematic theology has passed—Dr. Headlam very naturally protests against the misleading associations of the word 'dogmatic'—this essay may perhaps convince him of the contrary. The third and fourth essays, 'The New Theology' and 'The Athanasian Creed,' will possibly make a less wide appeal. Dr. Headlam shews conclusively from the history and past use of the Athanasian Creed that the Church of England may rightly claim the fullest liberty in dealing with it, though we do not think he would deny that there are other considerations than these with which he deals, which may give us pause when its disuse is suggested.

The fifth and sixth essays, 'The Church of England and the Eastern Churches' and 'The Teaching of the Russian Church,' go together. As Dr. Headlam remarks in his introductory essay, 'that position which the Church of England arrived at independently, and upon which it based its Reformation, is substantially the position which the Eastern Church has preserved from primitive times,' and his two later essays bear out his contention. But he shews us at the same time how much the English Church has to learn from the Russian, especially in its exaltation of the Church as distinguished from the exaltation of the clergy, and in its broad and noble grasp of the Communion of Saints. We would also call attention to the account here given of the attitude really taken by Eastern Christendom towards the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation. The last two essays, 'Methods of Early Church History' and 'The Church of the Apostolic Fathers,' again go together. The former reviews the development of historical criticism concerning the origin of Christianity, from the time of the later Renaissance to our own day, while the latter seeks, chiefly by the use of Dr. Lightfoot's results, to construct a picture of Christian life at the beginning of the second century. If we have any quarrel with Dr. Headlam, it is that he seems to us in one passage to under-estimate the power of the New Testament to teach us the conditions of the Apostolic Age. 'The only true method,' he says, 'for the study of Church history is to start from the developed constitution and look back to the earlier period.' There is, of course, much

truth in this. As Newman pointed out to W. G. Ward, the Apostolic Church must have been a Church from which the later Church could spring, and it is characteristic of Dr. Headlam to insist upon the point. But do we not also need to remember that the history of the Church may shew us impoverishment as well as development, and that therefore, if we seek to understand the Church of the Apostles simply by working backward, we may fail to appreciate those elements in its life which were inadequately represented at a later time, and over-estimate those elements which were afterwards exaggerated? Shall we not be likely, for example, to overlook the extent to which even the authority of the Apostles rested upon their possession of the prophetic gift, upon their power of speaking 'in the word of the Lord,' and to lay too much stress upon their official position?

The Idea of the Resurrection in the Ante-Nicene Period. By Calvin Klopp Standt, Ph.D. (University of Chicago Press. 1909.) Post paid, 54 *cents.*

This treatise, issued under the auspices of the Department of Biblical and Patristic Greek in the University of Chicago, aims at setting forth the development of the idea of the Resurrection from its beginnings in the Old Testament to the writings of Lactantius. It is a vast theme before which scholars of world-wide reputation might have quailed, and any of its various parts taken alone might well demand a separate volume. That Dr. Standt has at all succeeded is due to the lightness with which he touches some parts of his subject in order to concentrate on others. Thus his first chapter on 'Jewish and Greek Literature' only fills seven pages out of eighty-one, and of these seven Greek thought fills only two. How slight his work is here may be gathered from the fact that, in speaking of the popular Greek beliefs of a future life, he makes no allusion to the eleventh book of the *Odyssey*, and, in discussing the influence of Plato, he has nothing to say about the *Republic*. We suspect that, on this subject, Dr. Standt has drawn on the information of others and not on his own reading. When he deals with the New Testament, he shews a surer touch. He treats excellently of the teaching of St. Paul, particularly in the connexion which he makes between the language of 1 Cor. xv. and that of 2 Cor. v., and in his insistence on the truth (so often misunderstood by later writers) that, when St. Paul draws out the analogy of the seed, he means to lay stress, not on the genetic relationship between seed and plant, but on 'the sovereign power

of God.' 'God giveth it a body according as He willeth' (καθὼς ἠθέλησεν). Dr. Standt, however, seems too anxious to acquit St. Paul of any inconsistency in 1 Cor. vi. 12-20, where the natural interpretation is that the bodies of men must be kept pure from defilement because they are to be raised up by the Lord, and so the homily known as the second Epistle of Clement does interpret it. After the discussion of the New Testament literature all is plain sailing. Dr. Standt handles his authorities easily. He picks out what is essential in them, and leaves on one side, or treats only so far as is necessary for his purpose, eschatological questions which are closely connected with that of the Resurrection, but are too often confused with it: he is constantly summarizing the conclusions to be drawn from a writer or group of writers. Naturally he devotes most space to Irenaeus and Tertullian, who did so much to determine the formal doctrine of the Church, but he passes almost all the early Fathers in an impartial and discriminating review. One who can speak of 'the crass materialism' of the narratives of St. Luke and St. John (a verdict which we are glad to find somewhat qualified on p. 84) finds most to attract him in the thought of Origen; but his interest in the great Alexandrian does not spoil the proportion of his work, and students who have heard their teachers speak of Athenagoras, or Theophilus of Antioch (the Father who wrote about the Resurrection without alluding to the rising of Jesus), or Tatian, or Methodius—who are often little more than names to most of us—will find here in a convenient form what can hardly be found elsewhere.

Immortality. By E. E. Holmes, Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, and of the Royal Chapel of St. Katherine, Regent's Park. 'Oxford Library of Practical Theology.' (Longmans. 1909.) 5s.

This book consists of a series of chapters, somewhat homiletic in tone, upon various aspects of the doctrine of the future life. It is written reverently and in an interesting style, and we do not doubt that it will be read by many with pleasure and advantage.

At the same time it must be confessed that the interest which it undoubtedly possesses depends rather upon an admirable felicity of quotation and the easy flow of the accomplished preacher than upon any original reflexion on the part of the author. He has, for instance, obviously no special

competence for treating such a subject as 'Immortality and Psychology.' In his view, apparently, the only connexion between the science of psychology and the doctrine of a future life lies in what he calls 'the alleged appearance of spirits.' On this subject his information seems largely derived from magazine articles, and he does not refer to the investigations of the late F. W. H. Myers. Why again, having written a chapter on 'Immortality and Reason,' and two on 'Immortality and Instinct,' should it be necessary to give, very much later in the book, a particularly weak chapter on 'Immortality and Common Sense'? The strongest parts of the work are those which deal with the idea of Immortality in Church teaching and Christian piety, in which the writer moves with the confidence of genuine knowledge and experience.

Christianity, its Nature and its Truth. By ARTHUR S. PEAKE, D.D., Professor of Biblical Exegesis in the University of Manchester. (Duckworth.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

THIS very able book has been written, as Dr. Peake himself tells us in his modest preface, 'for the sake of the young people in our churches, who are slipping away from the faith because they have been trained neither to understand nor to defend it.' Written in a vigorous and lucid style, the book holds the attention of the reader, but never at the cost of slurring over a difficulty. Indeed, one of the most engaging qualities of the work is its transparent candour. The author adopts the method of the candid inquirer rather than that of the partisan advocate, and, taking the reader into his confidence, tells him exactly how much weight he himself attaches to each argument and what objections lie against it. The advantages of this method are especially evident in the chapters on the Virgin Birth and Sin. While maintaining, upon the whole, the orthodox views, Dr. Peake avoids the error of alienating the intelligent reader by raising premature paeans of triumph at the end of an inconclusive argument. The chapter on 'Sin' is particularly noteworthy for an interesting and individual exegesis of Romans v. 12–21.

Dr. Peake is not open to the reproach, which Dr. Harnack brings against much modern Apologetic, that it knows not what it has to defend. Christianity to the author of this book is a message of salvation founded on the historical life and death of Jesus Christ. In an eloquent concluding chapter he brings

home, with truly evangelical fervour, the tremendous importance of the truths which he has been defending to the individual who needs redemption.

Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by J. HASTINGS, D.D., with the assistance of J. A. SELBIE, D.D., and other Scholars. Vol. II. 'Arthur—Bunyan.' (T. and T. Clark. 1909.) 28*s.* net.

DR. HASTINGS' great undertaking may fairly be said to have now established itself as so far original that it cannot be disregarded or neglected by students on the ground that the same information can be obtained elsewhere. They may wish that it were not so expensive (though the volumes can, we believe, be bought by instalments) or fancy that their own special subjects might perhaps have been treated even more fully; but the *Encyclopaedia* contains so much—we had almost said 'so much that is unexpected'—and is so admirably edited, that the note of criticism seems out of place.

Perhaps to the ordinary student the most marked feature in this second volume will seem to be the prominence of articles dealing with oriental religions and religious associations, and of those concerned with all branches of philosophy. The first group of subjects is treated at very considerable length, and with copious bibliographical references in addition. That many of these studies should assume a rather large amount of preliminary knowledge in the reader was perhaps inevitable, and it will be necessary to wait for future volumes in order to see how far the scheme adopted is successful in giving a general outline of the main branches of the subject as well as the detailed studies of more recondite features. We are a little sorry that more space was not allowed to the 'Avesta' article, which might with advantage have extended to twice the length (eleven columns) given to it. The articles on 'Australia,' 'Australasia' (Borneo is reserved for 'Indonesia'), 'Bantu and S. Africa,' 'Berbers and N. Africa,' are full of interesting matter. In dealing with philosophical subjects Dr. Hastings has determined to err rather on the side of excess than of defect. Hence we find articles on the 'Atomic Theory,' 'Biology,' 'Atheism' (10 studies), 'Being,' 'Belief,' 'Beauty,' 'Attention' and like psychological studies, besides biographies such as those of 'Avicenna,' 'Bacon,' 'Bain,' 'Berkeley,' 'Bruno,' etc., which are useful summaries, and not infrequently something more.

As 'Religion' is a widely inclusive term, we are given articles on 'Babylonians and Assyrians,' 'Badges,' 'Banners,' 'Bards' (Breton, Irish, and Welsh), as well as on specific manifestations of it. The three long articles (46 pages in all) by Dr. Sanday, Dr. von Dobschütz, and Dr. Dorner on 'Bible,' 'Bible in the Church,' and 'Bibliolatry,' will be studied with great interest, both for themselves and for the various points of agreement and difference which they disclose. The concluding section (on 'The Bible and Hostile Influences') in the second, with its contention that 'the chief enemy of the Bible is ignorance of it,' should be widely read. The articles connected with ecclesiastical history and antiquities include, among others, biographies of 'St. Athanasius,' 'St. Augustine' (a study which seems designed rather to prove that Professor Warfield's views are right than to illustrate those of St. Augustine), 'Basilides,' and 'Bunyan,' as well as articles on the 'Barnabites,' 'Beatification,' 'Brownism,' a very useful little account of 'Bulls and Briefs' (by Fr. Thurston, S.J.), and a more elaborate series of studies of over forty pages by various writers on 'Baptism' among different peoples of different faiths.

Upon the articles which may be classed as unexpected opinions will probably differ according to the pursuits of the reader. The study of 'Arthur and the Arthurian Cycle,' with which the volume opens, is so interesting as to disarm any questioner, and the article on 'Beadle,' though it does scant justice to the importance of the English functionary—it is written by a Scottish professor—contains useful references and some good stories, which seem curiously placed in so grave a work. Many readers no doubt know the history of the title *Pontifex Maximus*, but few will not find much to learn in the article 'Bridge,' especially perhaps in relation to folk-lore and even such matters as the children's game 'London Bridge,' or the old 'Lyke-Wake Dirge,' which is said to have been sung in Yorkshire till 1624. There are thirteen articles on 'Birth' as well as two on 'Birthdays'; in most cases where, as, for example, in regard to the articles on 'Asceticism' and 'Austerities,' there might seem to be an unnecessary duplication, it will be found that the subjects have been so treated as to involve a minimum of overlapping. 'Boycotting' perhaps justifies itself as an ethical problem; will the same consideration lead to the inclusion of 'Picketing,' peaceful or otherwise? The article on 'Athletics' deals with the physical and moral

effects of various forms of exercise (to be amplified, apparently, in a future volume, *s.v.* 'Games'), with such ethical judgements as are involved in the writer's condemnation of 'big shoots,' in which 'there is wanton destruction of birds which may almost be described as domesticated fowl,' or in the *obiter dictum* that 'A good Master of Hounds is as humane as he is expert, as just as he is ingenious, in the pursuit of stag, fox, or otter.'

Religion and the Modern Mind. 'St. Ninian Lectures.' Two Volumes. (Hodder and Stoughton. 1908, 1909.) 5*s.* each.

THE first of these volumes contains ten lectures out of a series of fifteen delivered in the winter of 1907–8 before the Glasgow University Society of St. Ninian, a society formed for the meeting of 'all students, whatever their academic faculty or their attitude to current beliefs and organisations,' who wish 'to investigate with candour modern problems of religious faith and duty,' and rightly named after the great Evangelist who in the fourth century (not the third, as Dr. Macalister states in his Introduction) did so much to bring the light of the Gospel to the Picts of South-Western Scotland. The lectures cover a very large field, and are of very diverse value; but the authors, almost without exception, approach the subject in the frank and reverent spirit of seekers after truth, and their combined labours have produced a book well worth reading. If, here and there, there is a certain tendency to sermonize or an excessive flavour of the manse, yet in most parts we are struck by the power and literary ability of the lecturers, whose work sometimes attains real distinction. Naturally we read with special interest Mr. J. M. Robertson's lecture on 'Comparative Hierology and the claims of Revelation,' and we confess that he puts his case clearly and well; yet there is a 'cocksureness' in what he says (*e.g.* about miracles, p. 45) which is happily absent from the rest of the volume, and his dismissal of the evolutionary view of the Jewish religion and Revelation is too cursory and contemptuous to satisfy anyone. Moreover, to conclude, as he does, that 'the best religion will simply be the most highly evolved' (p. 57) is to beg the whole question. Everything depends on what is meant by 'highly,' and the upholder of Christianity is at liberty to maintain, as at least one other lecturer maintains, that Jesus Christ does supply something which has been the greatest force influencing human conduct for good' (p. 227). The quotation from Dr. Romanes on pp. 172–3, or that from Dr. Huxley on p. 226, are a valuable

antidote to a great deal of the loose writing of the Rationalist Press.

Father Crofton, in dealing with 'Science and Religion,' seems rather to underrate the seriousness of the conflict between the two, and Dr. Cooper dwells too much on the Scriptural evidence, too little on the intellectual justification for the Doctrine of the Trinity; but the lectures on 'Comparative Religion and the Christian Faith' and 'Agnosticism in Dogma, Method, and Life,' by Canon MacCulloch and Mr. P. C. Simpson respectively, are altogether admirable.

The other volume comprises a certain number of the lectures delivered to the Society in the year 1908–9, and the level reached in the earlier series is still well maintained. A few of the authors adopt a slight and popular style, hardly suitable for an academic audience which *ex hypothesi* demands a learned discussion; but in most cases those who came to hear a serious contribution to a great subject will not have gone away disappointed.

Mr. McCabe writes on 'The Conflict of Science and Religion' with admirable moderation of tone. He seems, however, to argue as if the whole case for the Fall of Man rested on one section of the Bible, whereas the third chapter of Genesis has had notoriously little influence on later Biblical Theology, and the true evidence for the belief rests, as Bishop Gore points out, on the fact 'that human nature, as we have had experience of it in history, presents in great measure a scene of moral ruin'—not to be lightly disproved by the existence of the Pithecanthropus or the Neolithic man. And, in his enthusiasm for Evolution, Mr. McCabe forgets that perfect products are not discredited by humble origins.

Dr. Estlin Carpenter contributes an interesting paper on 'Christianity and Historical Science.' We agree with him that 'the phenomena of primitive Christianity should be examined and classified on the same principles and by the same methods as those which are applied first of all to the contemporary and surrounding religions and secondly to the faith of more distant lands.' But we think him unduly anxious to find parallels in cases where specifically Christian doctrines are not in question, and forgetful of the similarity of form in which religious experience tends to clothe itself in very different parts of the world. Nor can we follow him in all that he says about Buddha, for (*a*) the kind of wonder-working attributed to him differs *toto caelo* from the miracles of Christ, and (*b*) the record containing it cannot challenge comparison with the authenticity of the Gospels.

Canon MacCulloch again writes well on 'Comparative Religion,' this time in relation to 'the Historic Christ.' But it is a pity that he wastes so much time over Mr. J. M. Robertson, whose perversity in interpretation would make nonsense of all Christian history. And on p. 164, where he says that St. Paul's teaching 'presupposes' the Virgin Birth, he seems rather to overstate his case.

Mr. M. L. Walker has a most suggestive essay on Haeckel, but the palm goes to the two last writers in the book, Dr. J. Moffatt ('Modern Criticism and the Religion of Jesus') and Dr. G. Milligan ('Paulinism and the Religion of Jesus'). We will not spoil their work by quoting it. Every word deserves to be read—and marked.

The Religion of the Common Man. By Sir Henry Wrixon, K.C. (Macmillan. 1909.) 3s. net.

The writer of this little book tries to put himself in the position of 'a man of average intellect and ordinary information' who wishes, for his own guidance, to throw some light on the problem of the existence of a Deity whom men ought to worship. For the most part he follows well-worn paths. Beginning with the certainty of his own self-consciousness (*Cogito, ergo sum*), he passes thence (1) by a survey of the universal Order and of the equally universal Instinct prevailing outside him to the idea of a supreme Intelligence, and (2) by the fact of conscience within man, attested by the collective experience of the race, to the idea of a supreme Goodness. From these lines of thought 'the Common Man,' who has apparently read much of his Butler and his Paley, is led to believe that there is a God; and he finds his conclusions supported by countries so widely different as Egypt, Africa, and Japan—by foes of Christianity like Rousseau or Caecilius (who is introduced as if 'the Common Man' would be likely to know him), by scientists like Newton, or Richard Owen, or Charles Darwin. He then discusses two classes of difficulties: firstly, those arising from the apparent insignificance of man and this speck of the universe in which he lives (difficulties which, to our mind, are not likely to assail 'the Common Man'); secondly, those arising from the nature of evil. He has much that is valuable to say in this last discussion, but we cannot help regretting that he has fallen into the mistake of confusing physical with moral evil. The spirit of the book is excellent.

We wish that the author had not kept up his literary disguise by continually misplacing his commas and splitting his infinitives.

III.—Dogmatic Theology.

1. *Introduction to Dogmatic Theology.* By the Rev. Francis J. Hall, D.D., Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the Western Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois. (Longmans, Green, and Co. 1907.) 6*s.* net.
2. *Authority, Ecclesiastical and Biblical.* By the same. (Longmans, Green, and Co. 1908.) 6*s.* net.
3. *The Being and Attributes of God.* By the same. (Longmans, Green, and Co. 1909.) 6*s.* net.

These are the first three of a contemplated series of ten volumes intended to form a complete and connected treatise on Dogmatic Theology. The author is well known in America and England as a learned and cautious theologian. In these three volumes the general standpoint is that of the Tractarian theology, linked with an accurate and sympathetic knowledge of much modern criticism and research. Christianity is regarded as a revealed religion. Authority resides in the Church and is based on Holy Scripture. Parts of the Church have their limited authority for their own members. Their decisions, like their life, depend on their relation to the Universal Church. In the ascertaining and holding of truth reason has a real place. From the general standpoint thus developed in the first two volumes, Dr. Hall in his third volume deduces the doctrine of the Being and attributes of God. Both the arguments for the existence of God and the treatment of His Being and attributes follow the traditional lines, but the traditional lines in the light of recent investigations, and expressed so as to be in harmony with much in the conclusions of modern science. For instance, the teleological argument for the existence of God is stated, not in the cruder form in which it appeared in Paley's *Natural Theology*, but in a form which allows for the hypothesis of evolution and is not inconsistent with the Darwinian theory of natural selection; and in the great stress laid on the transcendence of God His immanence is not forgotten. The theology taught throughout the three volumes is very distinctly and strongly conservative; but it is evident that the writer has not been afraid to face the arguments and conclusions of liberal theologians;

and, where anything in these arguments or conclusions has seemed to him to be of value, to incorporate it into his work. The great compression made necessary by the amount of matter and the size of the volumes increases the difficulty inseparable from such a book; the whole method of treatment is suited for students of theology rather than for the general public; we are not sure that the writer in his extensive study of modern writers has given sufficient attention to some of the more recent French works on philosophy and theology; the style is occasionally awkward, and we have noticed a very few slips of the pen. Subject to these qualifications, the volumes now before us may be highly commended as an excellent presentation of the doctrines which they embody; and we shall look forward with great interest to those which have still to appear. Each volume is sold separately and forms a complete book.

The Doctrine of the Church. By A. C. A. Hall, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Vermont. (Sewanee, Tennessee: The University Press at the University of the South.) $1.25.

This is the first volume of the 'Sewanee Theological Library,' a series edited by the Rev. A. R. Gray, Chaplain of the University of the South, and intended to provide statements of doctrine, discipline, and worship for clergy and laity, as well as to afford text-books to candidates for Holy Orders. It is part of the design of the series that the volumes may be of use to churchmen of all types. The present volume supplies a short and clear and careful treatment of the traditional theology concerning the main parts of Christian doctrine. It is likely to be very useful to educated and thoughtful readers who desire such a sketch. To some extent it suffers for practical purposes from the brevity which we suppose to be necessitated by the plan of the series. This brevity makes some parts difficult for any not already familiar with the subjects treated; there are sentences which seem to demand explanation in order to justify them; and as a text-book for candidates for Holy Orders it is wholly inadequate, except as an outline to be filled by other study. Probably the absence of any sign that the writer is acquainted with recent discussions about the New Testament, and in particular the Gospels, which are very prominent at the present time and bear intimately on subjects which he treats, is due to the same limitation of space.

Histoire des Dogmes. II. *De Saint Athanase à Saint Augustin* (318–430). Par J. TIXERONT. (Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre. J. Gabalda et Cie. 1909.) 3 *fr.* 50.

M. TIXERONT has acted wisely in abandoning his original plan of completing his History of Dogma to the time of Charles the Great in two volumes. He has limited the second volume to the period ending with the death of St. Augustine, and has left the history from the fifth to the ninth century for a third volume. As it is, the second volume consists of 534 closely printed pages, and is a marvel of compression. In view of the greater complexity of the materials, it is even more remarkable than the first volume for the power of dealing lightly and easily with masses of evidence, and for bringing out the salient points of the history without overloading the work. The second volume, like the first, is no less remarkable for fairness than for learning and skill; and both volumes may be commended in the strongest terms to those who wish to make a careful and detailed study of the doctrine of the early Church. One exception to this general fairness—probably an unintentional exception—strikes an Anglican critic. The allusion to the Novatians in the sentence in which M. Tixeront says of St. Ambrose that he 'conclut encore qu'être en communion avec l'Église de Rome, c'est l'être avec l'Église catholique, et que les novatiens ne sauraient posséder l'héritage de Pierre puisqu'ils n'en possèdent pas le siège,' might not be sufficient to suggest to an unwary reader, unacquainted with the passages which are not quoted, that it was in the alternative between the Church at Rome and the Novatians that St. Ambrose held this strong view as to the necessity of communion with Rome, and that it would not follow from it that he thought communion with Rome to be in all circumstances and for all persons a necessity of communion with the Catholic Church. We have noticed this instance, in which perhaps M. Tixeront has fallen a victim to the snare of brief statement on complicated matters, the more because of his usual scrupulous care to be exact in regard to teaching about the see of Rome as in regard to other matters.

Anselm's Theory of the Atonement. 'Bohlen Lectures,' 1908. By GEORGE CADWALADER FOLEY, D.D., Professor of Homiletics and Pastoral Care in the Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Philadelphia. (Longmans. 1909.) 5*s.* net.

DR. FOLEY'S book contains careful and systematic statements

of the teaching about the Atonement in the Fathers and in St. Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*, a slighter treatment of the theology of the Reformers, and a collection of brief quotations from modern writers. He writes in strong opposition to the theory of St. Anselm, and to doctrines of the Reformers which were based on or resembled it. Many of his criticisms are valuable and well put. The weak point in the book is the failure, notwithstanding some pages on the merits in St. Anselm's treatise, to recognize that the essential thought of the *Cur Deus Homo*, as distinct from the setting due to the methods of the age and the temper of the author, is that insistence on the actual deliverance accomplished by our Lord which underlay the general patristic teaching about His work, and on the fact that such deliverance was beyond the power of any merely human being or of collective humanity. Dr. Foley's book is useful as it stands; but work of higher value might have been produced if he had observed more clearly the real identity of belief on a central point beneath external differences in modes of expression. A somewhat fuller sympathy might have added much.

The Holy Sacrifice and its Ceremonies: An Explanation of its Mystical and Liturgical Meaning. By M. C. Nieuwbarn, O.P., S.T.L. Translated from the revised edition by L. M. Bowman. (Burns and Oates. 1909.) 2*s*.

This is an explanation, designed as a help to devotion, of the mystical significance which, in the course of time, has come to be attached to the rite and ceremonies and vestments of the Roman Missal. It is intended for Roman Catholics, and its usefulness will be chiefly for them. The standpoint is throughout that of the ordinary Roman Catholic theology; the doctrine of Transubstantiation is assumed[1]; and considerable pains is taken to fit in what is said about the Eucharistic sacrifice with the definitions of sacrifice which specify the need of some kind of destruction. There is much of interest on matters of devotion and practice. The following of the service by those present is contemplated; stress is laid in many passages on the share of the people in the offering of the sacrifice; this share is regarded as more complete in those who receive Communion; a wish is expressed for daily Communion as the rule; and the author in commenting on the

[1] In some places the English translation (we do not know the Dutch original) seems to imply that the elements remain only in appearance.

Communion of the celebrant writes, 'The faithful should also receive Holy Communion in conformity with the true spirit of the Mass, and in compliance with the express wish of the Council of Trent and our Holy Father, Pope Pius X,' and says that all present 'should at least make an act of spiritual Communion,' 'even if they do not approach the sacred table.' The preface to the second Dutch edition mentions that the first edition, consisting of nearly 10,000 copies, was sold out within three weeks. We hope that this is a sign of some success attending the writer's aim to promote a more intelligent and devout use of attendance at the Mass; and in this way we can wish the book well, even though there are parts of it with which we cannot agree, and though here and there the author's scholarship leaves something to be desired.

IV.—Sermons and Addresses.

Christus Crucifixus. By J. G. Simpson, D.D., Principal of the Clergy School, Leeds. (Hodder and Stoughton. 1909.) 6*s*.

Everything that Dr. Simpson writes is distinguished by vigour and strength of thought and by freshness of expression. And the volume which he calls *Christus Crucifixus* reveals those qualities in a considerable degree. Under this title he has grouped together two Oxford University sermons, some lectures on the Epistle to the Hebrews, a course of sermons on the Prodigal Son, and addresses on the Seven Words from the Cross, all more or less closely related to the central theme, on which he insists as forcibly as any Evangelical preacher of the eighteenth century, yet with a special appropriateness to the needs of the twentieth. If all the contents of the book were up to the level of the first sermon—on 'the Meekness of the Cross'—there would be no two opinions as to its merits. Nothing could be more suggestive than the way in which, in that sermon, the preacher draws the picture of the rich young man and the claim which Christ makes upon him (pp. 6–7); or describes the humility of the Son of God, not as something transitory or 'economic,' but as something eternal and congenial to His very Being; or finds in humility a really positive content, far beyond the bare consciousness of limitation. But the very excellence of this sermon makes us dissatisfied with the rest. In 'the Message of the

Epistle to the Hebrews' there is much that one would gladly praise—the insistence on the death of Christ as an essential feature of His revelation, though we think that, in view of such passages as Eph. i. 10, justice has hardly been done to the idea of Christ as 'the necessary consummator of an age-long development'; the elaborate distinction drawn between 'made with hands' and 'made without hands'; the illuminating thought about the Mercy Seat as 'the very centre of Hebrew worship, surrounded on every side by the courts in which the Sacrificial worship was performed.' Yet the net result of the argument is disappointing. Many of us may have felt that Bishop Westcott's commentary on the Epistle is harder to grasp than the Epistle itself; and one feels that Dr. Simpson too has not always thrown light on what he seeks to explain. Perhaps the reason is that he is so anxious to say something forcible and arresting that he is often at the mercy of an epigram or a 'bizarre' turn of phrase, and so he spoils the eloquence of which he is a real master. No one could wish for a simpler or more Christian treatment of Christ's atoning death than is to be found in the third sermon on the Prodigal Son; no one could fail to be attracted by the beauty of the interpretation of the fifth Word from the Cross. If only the lectures on the Epistle to the Hebrews had been as clear as the one, and the address on the Dereliction had given as much help as the other!

We have noticed a good many misprints—on p. 15 'crises' for 'crisis'; p. 103, 'Norman' for 'Newman'; p. 105, 'would cause misgiving' for 'would not cause misgiving'; p. 225, 'vision' for 'version.' On pp. 71 and 129 some accident has happened to the type.

Jésus-Christ: Sa Vie, Son Temps. Par le Père Hippolyte Leroy, S.J. (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne et Cie. 1908.) 3 *fr.*

This is a set of lectures, in continuation of a series extending over thirteen years and delivered at the Jesuit churches in Paris and Brussels. It follows the Gospel story from the eschatological discourses of our Lord to the last Passover. It has received the special benediction of Pius X, and dutifully adopts the Papal view of Modernism in a short introduction to the first lecture. The Encyclical, the lecturer informs his hearers, has caused him to re-examine the work that he has already done, which, in spite

of many imperfections, he is convinced has no trace of 'la caricature du modernisme.' The number and gravity of the errors of these new theologians, he further assures his audience, no great scholarship is necessary to detect. In fact, a knowledge of the catechism and 'une certaine dose de bon sens' would have been sufficient to foresee the severe blow that has fallen upon them. Doubtless. But a couple of pages, which is all that M. Leroy condescends to devote to the subject, if sufficient to reassure the pious congregation at the Gésu, will hardly make much impression upon a widespread intellectual movement. For the rest, the minuteness with which the lecturer informs his congregation of the simplest details of the Synoptic narrative is an interesting commentary on the absence of primary Christian literature in the Catholic households of Belgium, which Cardinal Mercier in his famous Pastoral naïvely deplores. And what would an average congregation of presumably instructed English Christians think of the sentence in which a description of our Lord's final departure from Bethany is concluded? 'Jésus déjà loin, se retourne, regarde encore une fois sa très sainte Mère et disparait.'

It is scarcely necessary to add that M. Leroy, the submissive Jesuit, must not be confused with M. Le Roy, the rebellious Modernist.

Missions in State and Church. Sermons and Addresses. By P. T. Forsyth, M.A., D.D. Principal of Hackney College, Hampstead. (Hodder and Stoughton. 1908.) 6*s*.

Dr. Forsyth has already so firmly established his reputation as a thinker and preacher that little need be said to commend this volume of sermons. They strike the reader by their extraordinary length: the first, for example, extends to no less than forty-seven pages. Indeed, though there are nearly three hundred and fifty pages in the book, they are divided among no more than ten sermons. It is perhaps not so much the structure and plan of the whole, as the pregnant utterances which abound on page after page, that impress the imagination. If a criticism were to be made, perhaps it would be that discourses less loaded with aphorism and epigram might gain in effect. To the mind of a churchman also the nonconformist point of view seems at times to be rather dragged in by the heels. But in this matter we are perhaps incompetent judges.

The Sound of a Voice that is still. A selection of sermons preached by the late Dean BUTCHER of Cairo. (London: J. M. Dent and Co., Ltd.)

THESE sermons, introduced by a short record of the preacher's life, form an interesting memorial of one who was no ordinary man and no conventional teacher. That an outpost of the Church of England, like the congregation of Cairo, should have enjoyed the ministrations of Dean Butcher, was an advantage not always at the command of isolated chaplaincies in a foreign land. There is nothing commonplace in any of these short utterances, which cover a wide area of Christian thought and life. The Dean was a sincere believer, but it is zeal for religion rather than orthodoxy which inspires his teaching. It is not necessary to endorse every opinion which he puts forward in order to recommend a study of his words to thoughtful preachers and all earnest men.

Churchmanship and Character. Three Years' Teaching in Birmingham Cathedral. By W. H. CARNEGIE, M.A., Rector and Canon of Birmingham Cathedral. (John Murray. 1909.) 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE weakness of this book seems to be that it does not sufficiently recognize that religion is a flame. The author wants to interpret Christianity to the healthy Englishman, who would be astonished and not a little uncomfortable if our sons and daughters were to prophesy. This is all very well, but what is wanted is a rekindling. Duty without enthusiasm is a cold atmosphere for the awakening of faith. Modernism, which the author lucidly explains, has its work to do in making faith rational, but it will never quicken rationalism into faith. The want of sympathy with parochial missions, which is here avowed, is characteristic of the view of religion which these chapters express. It is to the possessors of a somewhat frigid conscience that Christ is represented as making His appeal in a passage like the following:

> 'He was to them the great interpreter of conscience; the life to which He introduced them was the life of duty expressed in its highest terms, the life of duty made intelligible by His teaching and made possible through the aid of the resources which He placed at their disposal.'

But the book has many merits which will commend it to that large body of churchmen who distrust emotions, and important truths are stated in terse and crisp language. 'Doctrines,' for

example, it is asserted, 'are not the essential and permanent factors in belief. They represent men's efforts to interpret the facts of the historical revelation of Christ and to relate them to their own religious needs.' This wants saying, and it is well said.

V.—Pastoral Theology.

The Ministry of the Church of England. (Record Newspaper Office. 1910.) 3*d.*

This collection of addresses, given at the Islington Clerical Meeting of 1910, ought to be widely read. It is a discussion of the clerical office by Evangelical clergy who are well-informed about modern needs. The discussion is conducted on a high level of thought and expression. In the words applied by one of the speakers to some recent Manuals, we may say of the addresses as a whole, 'In them Evangelical [opinions] are defined without a breath of bitterness or a trace of feebleness.'

This small book gives evidence of a *rapprochement* of attitude between recent Evangelicalism and the sober High Church party. The Evangelicalism of to-day is strong enough to disregard 'whisperings of the thin end of the wedge,' and to recognize that 'Because some err by excess we may not excuse ourselves if we err by defect.' Prebendary Eardley-Wilmot's emphasis on the 'external' side of vocation and the authoritative side of the clerical commission, Mr. Lisle Carr's appreciation of daily services and retreats, Canon Denton Thompson's bold assertion of the Prayer Book teaching on Absolution, Prebendary Burroughs' commendation of 'time spent in the quiet handling of Holy vessels and of *unconsecrated* elements, after the service,' are not without significance. But such quotations as these signify no departure from the positive tradition of Evangelicalism. The addresses as a whole, beginning with Mr. Procter's testimony, 'The Church is meant supremely to be a spiritual force,' and ending with Prebendary Burroughs'. 'The world begins to expect the Church of Christ to be a great standing witness to the reality and power of the spiritual world,' are faithful throughout to the 'Evangelical' note of spirituality and of protest against worldliness, while they are free from excessive individualism. Once or twice only, as in Mr. Procter's allusion to theological colleges which may turn out men 'Roman in garb, Roman in teaching, and Roman in ritual,' we hear the old note of rather undiscriminating

protest. In Mr. Carr's able summary of the more modern needs of clerical equipment we observe a certain tenderness of mind in the absence of all reference to questions of 'Higher Criticism.' Dr. Wace's stout championship of the Establishment, 'The King's Courts are Christian Courts,' with his reminder that 'rulers are not a terror to good works,' does not seem to afford a final solution of pressing problems of 'Church and State'; but we welcome his timely plea for mutual deference.

Though on a few such particulars as these we should be inclined to criticize, yet we salute with the friendliest of feelings this report of the eighty-second annual meeting at Islington. It is a sign of the times, let us hope, that Dr. Dawson Walker should testify, while discussing the supply of clergy, 'Our High Church friends are grappling with the difficulty in a way that should win our admiration.' Most remarkable of all the addresses is that of Mr. Denton Thompson. We note his firm grasp on social problems, and we observe that he shares to the full that appreciation of the corporate idea which lies at the base of a true doctrine of the Church. 'If a member, then a communicant, and if not a communicant then not a member, is the norm or rule of the Church.' We do not understand Mr. Denton Thompson to disparage the status of the baptized, but rather to emphasize the indispensable ideal of full membership. The Communicant Body, its powers, possibilities, and responsibilities, is a subject which will more and more exercise the mind of the Church. Would that this and other vital subjects were discussed by all 'parties' in the Church with more of the temperance and wisdom which pervade this last message from Islington!

The Educational Ideal in the Ministry. 'Lyman Beecher Lectures,' 1908. By W. H. P. Faunce, President of Brown University. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1908.) 5s. net.

The Church Minister and his Duties. By J. Oswald Dykes, D.D. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.) 6s. net.

Pastoral Theology would seem to be one of the weightiest of subjects, yet it lends itself in an unexpected way to lightness of touch. A reason for this may lie in the close contact of the subject with human life. Be that as it may, Dr. Faunce gives us a book which is instinct with life. His thesis is that the vast changes of the last fifty years have seriously affected the standing

of the three time-honoured professions, Medicine, the Ministry, and the Law. He considers that the conception of the ministry has passed through four stages, the liturgical, the magisterial, the oratorical, and the educational. In the last and present stage the Church recovers the original conception of the ministry and allies itself with the most powerful forces of our time.

The present is an age of specialism and detail, but the vision of the whole, and the sense of the unity of life and of the nearness of God, must be brought into men's lives. It is only religion which can fuse the jarring elements of human life into a harmonious unity. The Christian minister brings to his work 'certain standards of value which had their origin in the consciousness of Jesus Christ.' His function is to apprehend and interpret the ideals and standards which Christ has given us. He must meet the present age of transition with the method of the writers of the New Testament. He must be possessed with a passionate and contagious conviction, and he must translate his message into familiar forms of thought. The Bible lends itself wonderfully to adaptation to the thought of the age. In saying this, the Old Testament must not be undervalued or overlooked. In many respects it is the complement of the New.

The Church has a splendid opportunity for leading in things ethical, and the minister should be well fitted to shew the way. It is indeed his duty to do so, but, generally speaking, he fails here. He is hindered by the tradition that Christian faith is a series of propositions, and that Christian morality is a series of prohibitions. In this connexion the writer says: 'The sole aim of Christianity is to make good men.' Does he go quite far enough here? In fact, this sentence seems to point to the chief defect of the book. The idea of salvation to life eternal does not seem to come much within the range of the writer's treatment. Christianity seems to be in his view a religion for the here and now. The heavenly is spoken of as the ethereal, and the horizon of the Church in the writer's mind does not seem to go beyond this world.

Other chapters deal with the place that psychology takes in fitting the minister for his task; with the opening, too often neglected, afforded by the Sunday School system; with the education of the minister by his task. Dr. Faunce discerns an antipathy between Church and College in their influence on religious life. The Church stands for synthesis as the foundation of theology and life, the College for analysis as the instrument of

knowledge. The Church stands for worship, the College for service. The Church stands for a religion of crises, the College for one of growth. Each needs to learn from the other, and the leading ideas of the two need to be blended.

Dr. Dykes' fifty years' ministerial experience, including twenty years as lecturer to candidates, give him an excellent right to expound the work of the ministry. His book is written, of course, from the Presbyterian standpoint, but with genuine appreciation of various distinctive features of the Church of England. Sometimes, however, the writer misunderstands the situation. He writes incorrectly of the Lectionary (p. 135). He assumes too much about the effect of the use of a liturgical form of prayer (p. 140). He states that the Church of England tacitly permits the use, without acknowledgement, of another man's sermon (p. 205). He tells us that the imposition of episcopal hands is really all that distinguishes Confirmation 'from such a ceremony of admission to full membership as is usual in other communions' (p. 349). Dr. Dykes attaches insufficient value to several matters which are of importance to churchmen, *e.g.* the Laying on of Hands in Ordination (pp. 39–41), but his treatment of the subject of Holy Communion is very good, and his censure of a low view of Baptism is quite to the point. On some details he somewhat surprises us. He advocates non-communicating attendance, children's Eucharists, the mixed chalice, and the invocation of the Holy Spirit on the elements.

Dr. Dykes' book lacks the freshness and directness of that of Dr. Faunce, qualities which are so characteristic of American theologians, but there is a depth of spiritual experience and obvious acquaintance with the best works on Pastoral Theology which may well recommend his book to the attention of churchmen.

A Bishop in the Rough. Edited by the Rev. D. Wallace Duthie, with a preface by the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Norwich. Illustrated. (Smith, Elder and Co. 1909.) 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

The Pastor and his Parish. By the Right Reverend John Sheepshanks, D.D., Lord Bishop of Norwich. (Hodder and Stoughton. 1909.) 5*s.*

All who care for adventure, pluck, and humour, for the Church and its missionary zeal, should read *A Bishop in the Rough.*

The Bishop is Dr. John Sheepshanks, who has lately resigned the see of Norwich. Mr. Wallace Duthie, one of his clergy, has dexterously woven the Bishop's diaries into his own plain narrative, in order to shew him 'in the rough,' that is, as a young man leaving Leeds, where he had received his early training in the ministry under that Titan, Dr. Hook, to become the first Rector of New Westminster in British Columbia. There he dealt faithfully with colonists, miners, Indians, winning love and respect and taking all fortune cheerfully. Thence, taking leave of absence, he sailed to San Francisco, visited Salt Lake City, preached at Brigham Young's invitation to the Mormons, saw New York, Niagara, Washington, and returned to England. Having gone back to New Westminster by way of Jamaica, he afterwards resigned that cure, took a holiday in Honolulu and the islands of the Pacific, extended his travels to Asia, and finally accomplished an immense journey through China, and across great plains, rivers, and mountains, to Siberia, Moscow, and so home to England. We admire as we read his endurance and high spirit, his earnestness and simplicity in the cause of Truth, his devotion under manifold difficulties to priestly studies—in which he was a 'disciple of the great teacher in Leeds who thought his morning wasted that did not begin at five and witness some striving of the brain.'

It is, in fact, a delightful book through which the wind of the world blows fresh. We turn from it to listen, with still deeper interest, to the Bishop, no longer in the rough, but formed and mellowed by long experience, charging his English clergy, while 'the thought inevitably rises to his mind that in all human probability this may be the last opportunity which he will have of addressing them at his Episcopal Visitation.' Some may disagree with this or that which he says about 'the Pastor and his Parish.' Some who are accustomed to the subtle reasoning or glorious aspiration of other devotional books, may wish, as Erskine did for Scott, to 'refine the flattened thought or cumbrous line,' but the Bishop, like the poet, knew better than his critic. Indeed, the plain, homely, natural language is no small part of the charm of this book. Others may object that in the frequent quotations from the Greek hardly a word is correctly accented. Pity 'tis, 'tis true. The Bishop must correct his proofs more patiently next time, and for this time we care very little about such trifles. For here is a book written in iron that bites into the conscience of the reader and makes him a much sadder, but a somewhat stronger, better priest,

The Bishop 'in the rough' learnt to love the average man. In these his last charges he speaks to the average man, remembering how low his ideal often is, how often custom and disappointment have broken down his once grander resolution, how much all leave undone, how hard it is to preserve the courage of a good hope. To such men—good hearted, but unprofitable and nigh unto a curse—that is, to most of us, if we would honestly face the fact, he speaks with severity and love and tenderest wisdom. It would be easy to quote many shrewd, many noble sentences. It is better in dealing with such a book to be silent. This is a book to be read, not criticized. It should be read, and read upon our knees, by all of us who are priests, perhaps especially by the priests of country villages. Others may sharpen our intellects, delight our fancy, soothe us with thoughts of peace. Here is the severity of honest faith wnich beats down self for the glory of God and love of the brothers for whom Christ died.

VI.—Sociology.

1. *The New Socialism*: *An Impartial Inquiry*. By Jane T. Stoddart. (Hodder and Stoughton. 1909.) 5*s*. net.
2. *Australian Socialism—An Historical Sketch of its Origin and Developments*. By A. St. Leger. (Macmillan and Co. 1909.) 4*s*. 6*d*. net.
3. *Le Génie de l'Amérique*. Par Henry Van Dyke. Traduit de l'Anglais par E. Sainte-Marie Perrin. Préface de A. Ribot de l'Académie Française. (Paris: Calmann-Lévy. 1909.) 3 *fr*. 50.
4. *The Coming Englishman*. By James Long. (Smith, Elder and Co. 1909.) 5*s*. net.

To Miss Stoddart many a perplexed thinker will be grateful for a judicial and informing book. She writes as one who has read deeply and widely in her subject, she brings together a great variety of typical and suggestive quotations, and though sometimes, in charging the jury, as it were, on this great issue, she may be a little disjointed and inconclusive, the reader is made to feel that this is almost a necessity of the case and at least far preferable to a shallow dogmatism or a spurious completeness. If, before reading *The New Socialism*, one has sometimes said, with discouraging results, that every man ought at least to have been for one moment tempted to be a

socialist, one is moved as one closes this thoughtful essay, to risk saying it once more.

Perhaps there is nothing more distinctively modern than the dawning recognition of the part played by error, or at least by unverified hypothesis, in humanizing, as it were, new or forgotten truth and giving vitality to pious and, in their native purity, inoperative opinions. The brotherhood of man, the crying urgency of the needs and miseries and wrongs of the many, the awful responsibility of the folded hands and the closed eyes—these are lessons which, if we refuse to learn them from Christianity, socialism will not suffer us to forget.

If the fine balance of the claims to self-fulfilment as between the component atoms and the organic whole—the mystery, in short, of personality—is not solved by socialism, it is at least presented as no longer an academic problem.

The 'New Socialism' is, in Miss Stoddart's view, the socialism of the last ten years, 'The years 1897–98, the jubilee period of the Communist Manifesto, form the natural point of departure for a study of the New Socialism.' 'From that point onwards we can distinguish the three great modern groups—Revisionists, Orthodox Marxians, and Revolutionaries.' It is calculated that in 1907 the aggregate of voters representing these groups was close on 7,500,000.

Difficult as it is to outline this three-headed apparition, Miss Stoddart finds it to be practically exclusive of what is known as *Christian* socialism. This, with the professedly non-socialistic views represented by reformers like M. Sangnier and the Abbé Gayraud, forms a sort of attendant nebula—a phantom of a phantom, καπνοῦ σκιὰ—and at the opposite extreme, or, must we say, at the heart of real socialism, lies syndicalism.

It is well to see for what this inexpressive word really stands. Miss Stoddart does not supply us with any summarized account of its tenets, but her quotations from George Sorel and others present it to us as a movement of French and Italian pessimists and irreconcileables disenchanted with parliamentary and political socialism, despising the labour member, and working frankly for revolution through the agency of the trades-unions and on the basis of class rather than party. It behoves us to look it squarely in the face and decide whether it is the true 'last word' and real evolutionary tendency of socialism. Meanwhile, 'the day of socialist victory, as Marx understood it, fades into an ever more distant future. The essential condition

of such a triumph is unity. At the present time there is no unity among socialists as to the goal they are seeking, or as to the means of reaching that goal. Nor is there any sign that the working men of the world are prepared to surrender patriotic interests and enter into a great cosmopolitan alliance for the overthrow of capitalistic rule and the establishment of the international socialistic state.'

Mr. St. Leger gives us an interesting, if less judicial, picture of what may be called a local and political socialism. Australia, he considers, has no real use for a social revolution. There we have a young and homogeneous people starting fair, without ancient evils to redress, in a wide, fertile, and virgin area, and a large and untainted air. Socialism was a foreign bacillus falling into the favourable nidus of one exceptional mind—that of the Canadian, William Lane. The account of Lane is vivid and full of interest. It is the picture of a sincere idealist of immense energy and personal magnetism. But Lane was driven into exile by the forces he had created, and socialism in Australia rapidly became a party weapon associated with a scurrilous press and a disingenuous policy. Pragmatism is the true note of the Australian labour party. It is essentially practical, but it has never got rid of Lane's idealism, which is, at bottom, alien to its temperament and circumstances.

In his chapter on 'Socialism and Population,' Mr. St. Leger offers a partial explanation of the anomaly. He points out that Australia is especially a continent of a few closely packed towns, and 'what Sydney, Melbourne, and Adelaide think to-day, New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia will think to-morrow,' and 'we have no evidence in Victoria, or perhaps anywhere in Australia (excepting Queensland), of a course of development corresponding with the provincial development of the United States, the United Kingdom, and (more recently) of Canada.' For this reason a socialistic tendency is more easily manufactured in Australia than in Paris or Berlin. 'Behind Paris lies a people and a nation; behind Berlin, another people and another nation. But behind Melbourne, Sydney, and a few of the larger towns [of Australia], there is yet, for the most part, a very sparsely settled territory.' Special interest also attaches to the chapters on 'Arbitration and Wages Boards' and 'Tariff Legislation.'

Dr. Van Dyke cleverly describes his own lectures as 'an intellectual motor tour.' Delivered in English to a Parisian

audience, they lend themselves readily to the French form in which they are here presented to us. Certainly it is of a French proverb that we are occasionally reminded as we become conscious of the somewhat anxious and sensitively defensive attitude which the author's patriotism assumes.

The translation reads well, but an Englishman may perhaps venture to question whether 'concient' on p. 85 is not a misprint for 'conscient,' and 'qu'on me permettre' (p. 4) for 'qu'on me permette.' 'C'est une âme qui forme une race,' that is the text of the discourse, and the preacher insists that, in spite of its heterogeneous population, America is essentially a country with a soul—and a soul worth studying.

One of the notes of this American spirit Dr. Van Dyke considers to be 'ce que les Anglais appellent "fairplay,"' and it is interesting to find M. Ribot devoting a couple of pages of his laudatory preface to the explanation of a term so impossible to translate. Among the American manifestations of the spirit of 'fairplay' Dr. Van Dyke has instanced the judicature, and M. Ribot does not fail to notice an error into which the lecturer has been betrayed by his almost nervous patriotism. In Europe, says Dr. Van Dyke, the accused is regarded as guilty till he has proved his innocence, in America he is regarded as innocent till his guilt is proved. 'Quoi! Dans toute l'Europe, même en Angleterre un innocent à la charge de prouver son innocence! C'est peut-être se montrer un peu injuste vers l'Angleterre et aussi envers quelques autres pays civilisés.' As regards England it is certainly a somewhat obvious injustice.

As regards literature, again, Dr. Van Dyke betrays a tendency to special pleading. It is true, he says, that in 200 years America has only begun to produce a noteworthy national literature, but consider how long it took the old countries to produce their best fruit. America, one is tempted to reply, was born grown up. The people who could formulate the American constitution had no phase of barbarism to outgrow, and there is no obvious reason why they should not have produced a Shakespeare as well as an Alexander Hamilton or a Washington. In a just appreciation of the difference between a traveller's knowledge of a country and the slower process of real intimacy, Dr. Van Dyke utters an unconscious prophecy of the English General Election of 1910. 'Je voudrais étudier la manière dont il emploie les résultats tangibles, à quel objet il les applique, dans quel but il dépense le fruit de son labeur,

et *quelle sorte de pain* il achète avec la sueur de son front ou de son cerveau.'

From Dr. Van Dyke to Mr. Long is a wide step. In *The Coming Englishman*, the intention, the first-hand knowledge, the fervour—everything is good—except the book, and of this it can only be regretfully said that, as a book, it is bad. The facts are not co-ordinated, the theories are not worked out with lucidity, the style is neither simple nor correct. It is not in a few instances, but on almost every page that the writing falls short of the humblest standard of literature and fails to do justice to the writer's evident sincerity. One is even left in some perplexity as to the lineaments of the New Englishman. He will, it seems, be a scientific farmer on not too large a scale, and even a scientific lover and mate, probably a Nonconformist, not above a simple taste for platitudes, certainly a person who neglects the niceties of grammar and enjoys a confusion of metaphors.

Even the late Prime Minister is made to speak the language of the new England—if indeed he is correctly quoted by Mr. Long as having said to a deputation: 'Let us in future try to save subsequent generations from suffering as they have suffered in the present owing to the lack of prescience in their forefathers.'

What wonder, then, that Mr. Long should write of 'those who aim by going beyond their depth to reach a higher platform of the social sphere,' or inform his readers that 'man in the abstract lives chiefly for himself, and to obtain it often gives his soul.'

But after all it is a far more serious matter when Mr. Long applies to the human race his advice on the breeding of stock, and prophesies that the time will come 'when sentiment will be abandoned in favour of a sense of duty to the race.' This, at least, has not so far been a plank in the platform of even the New Socialism.

VII.—Ecclesiastical Law.

The Law relating to Ecclesiastical Discipline over the Clergy of the Church of England. By Lewys L. Yeatman, Barrister. (London: Sweet and Maxwell, Limited. 1908.)

We regret that we are compelled to describe this as a worthless little book. The preface tells us that it is 'designed to enable

clergymen and others interested in the legal relations between the Church and her clerical members to understand the general principles upon which that discipline is exercised.' So far as the book deals with the history and antiquities of the subject, it is sketchy and superficial in the last degree. On the other hand, as an account of existing law and practice it abounds in serious errors both of statement and omission. On p. 11 the author tells us that the procedure in cases of immorality is under the Clergy Discipline Acts [*sic*] of 1840 and 1892; the fact being of course that to such cases the *Clergy* Discipline Act of 1892 applies, to the exclusion of the *Church* Discipline Act of 1840. Mr. Yeatman seems never to have heard of the Benefices Act, 1898, which is not once mentioned in his book. Accordingly he wholly ignores the alteration effected by that statute in the law as to simony, in the procedure in cases of alleged neglect of ecclesiastical duty, and in the definition of ecclesiastical duties set out at pp. 24–25. A perusal of the same Act would have saved him from the astonishing statement on p. 19 that 'as long as the incumbent is alive . . . the sale of the next presentation to a layman is valid.' The Court of the Commissary of the Archbishop is a diocesan court of the diocese of Canterbury, not, as stated on p. 7, a provincial court. On p. 22 part of the Pluralities Act, 1838, as to penalties for non-residence is copied out, but the provisions as to the recovery of the penalties are omitted. There are two meagre and futile paragraphs on deprivation at pp. 65–66, but no explanation of the principles governing the imposition of that censure, no reference to the judgements in *Combe* v. *De la Bere* and *Bishop of St. Albans* v. *Fillingham*, and no notice of the very important change in the practice as to sentences introduced by section 6 of the Clergy Discipline Act, 1892. The writing is often very slovenly. For example, on p. 8 we read: 'The Provincial Courts of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York are independent of one another; the process of one does not run into the other.' We will not pursue these criticisms further. Mr. Yeatman has made an unfortunate mistake in printing this book, but we hope that he will not be deterred by this from pursuing his studies in Ecclesiastical law, and joining himself to the scanty company of practising lawyers who take an interest in the subject.

VIII.—History and Antiquities.

Königliche Museen zu Berlin: Beschreibung der Bildwerke der christlichen Epochen. Dritter Band. *Altchristliche und Mittelalterliche, Byzantinische und italienische Bildwerke.* Bearbeitet von Oskar Wulff. Teil I. *Altchristliche Bildwerke.* (Berlin: Georg Reimer. 1910.) *il.* 15*s.*

The above lengthy title describes the recently published catalogue of the early Christian antiquities in the Kaiser Friedrich Museum at Berlin, which is shortly to be followed by a second part including those of Byzantine origin. The writer, Dr. Wulff, is known for an exhaustive study of the Church of the Assumption at Nicaea, and for other work in the province of Christian archaeology.

This large volume, with its seventy-five collotype plates and very numerous illustrations in the text, supplies all the information which a student can reasonably require. Every object is illustrated and concisely described; in the case of important works references are given to the literature of the subject; at the beginning of each section there is an introductory note in which essential facts bearing upon the history and development of the group are briefly discussed. The principal sections are: Sculpture in stone, wood, and metal; Bone-carvings; Goldsmiths' work and engraved gems; Ceramics and glass; and Painting. The ivory carvings in the Museum have already formed the subject of a separate volume. The thoroughness and method which characterize all the Berlin Catalogues are again conspicuous in the present example.

A first point which cannot fail to impress anyone who turns over the pages of the book is the great rapidity with which these collections have been brought together. Of the 1695 objects here treated, very few were in Berlin before 1895, and by far the greater number have been amassed within the last ten years. Not only must the resources at the disposal of Dr. Bode, the well-known Director of the Kaiser Friedrich Museum, be considerable, but his representatives in different countries must be both numerous and capable. From Egypt and the Nearer East he has thus succeeded in obtaining during a single decade series excelling those in museums which have collected in the same field for far longer periods. A highly efficient administration, presumably backed by generous external support and encouraged by a widely diffused public interest, has achieved results unparalleled in any other

country. It is only in the case of sections which at the present time are as a rule only to be increased by good fortune that the German Museum remains in a position of inferiority. Thus the British Museum is richer in goldsmiths' and silversmiths' work of early Christian times, in engraved gems, and in the gilded glasses of the catacombs ; in other sections it is decidedly outclassed. A second point which strikes the reader upon a nearer acquaintance with this catalogue is the overwhelming preponderance of objects from the Christian East. So few are those of Western origin that, but for the fragments of Roman sarcophagi at the beginning, their presence would hardly be remarked.

The part of the Berlin collections which at once attracts attention is the section devoted to sculpture. The period covered (IVth to VIIth centuries) is one of continuous decadence, but at the same time full of interest. The growth of the decorative principles which we vaguely describe as ' oriental ' at the expense of the Greek sense of form, the influence of new architectural conceptions upon the shape and ornamentation of the capital, the effect of Christian sentiment upon figure-sculpture—these are but a few of the problems for which we seek an answer, but which cannot be solved until the material representing the centuries after Constantine is far more accessible than it is at present. Among the monuments at Berlin which possess a high value from these points of view, we may mention the fine series of capitals and carved marble slabs, and several examples of figure sculpture. The most notable of the latter is the end of a sarcophagus from Sulu Monastir (the monastery of the Panagia Peribleptos) at Constantinople. It represents our Lord standing between two apostles, and belongs to a group of sarcophagi dating from the period between the second and fifth centuries, often known, from the place where a remarkable example of the style was found, as the Sidamara group. The Berlin fragment is the only representative of the type which can be definitely claimed as Christian ; it is dated by Dr. Wulff as fourth to fifth century, a later period than that assigned to it by Strzygowski, who preferred a time not far removed from the year A.D. 300. Whichever date be accepted, we have here a survival of the Hellenic manner which prevailed more than five hundred years earlier ; though by no means the best example from an artistic point of view—the finest are in the Cook collection at Richmond—it is still so full of dignity that the rapid decay of the glyptic art which followed within a century or two becomes the more remarkable. Within a very short time the idealism inherited from Hellenistic art was displaced by a

dry realism with little feeling for beauty, and before the eighth century sculpture upon the monumental scale had practically disappeared. One has only to compare the Christ and apostles of the Sulu Monastir sarcophagus with the fragment (No. 29) commonly known as the Peter relief, to appreciate the rapidity of the decline. This fragment, which in many respects recalls the style of the sarcophagi at Ravenna, was found in the neighbourhood of Sinope, and therefore within the sphere of influence of the same Proconnesian workshops from which, according to Wulff, the Sulu Monastir relief probably issued. But here the grace and the idealism are gone; we are left face to face with sheer unpoetical matter of fact. Succeeding numbers carry the process further. A sepulchral relief from Constantinople (No. 32), assigned to the seventh century, is a relief by courtesy only. If it had strength it would resemble archaic work; but it is flat and feeble, the evident production of a time in which figure-sculpture was very near its eclipse. Among the following examples of Coptic work, there are many which surpass it in crudity; but among them are fragments carved with merely ornamental designs which are often both effective and beautiful. In decorative sculpture Syrian influence was early felt, and was exerted to the general advantage of Christian art.

We have dwelt at some length upon the sculpture illustrated in this catalogue, because it is of exceptional importance to the student of Christian archaeology. The remaining sections, though they make a less immediate appeal, have each their individual attractions: both in ceramics and in bronze the material here assembled is comprehensive; while the last group includes objects illustrating both the encaustic and tempera methods of painting. The former style carried on the tradition of the Fayûm portraits, and was popular with Christian artists for a considerable period; a palette from Cairo in this technique (No. 1605) is attributed to the sixth or seventh century. The Kaiser Friedrich Museum is to be congratulated on the production of a work which will singularly facilitate the study of Christian antiquities in countries less richly endowed than Germany with original monuments.

Memorials of Old Staffordshire. Edited by Rev. W. Beresford, R.D. (London: George Allen and Sons. 1909.) 15s. net.

We can at the outset congratulate the editor of this book on the wide scope of his ecclesiastical memorials, for on p. 124 we

are introduced to St. Chad and the well in which legend says that he baptized his converts; while on p. 61 we are shewn the Rev. Thomas Gisborne walking with Wilberforce in the former's beautiful park at Yoxall Lodge, and talking over with him the interests of the Clapham sect. In fact, width of scope is at once the charm of this handsome volume and the characteristic of the county under consideration; for does it not include features as varied as Lichfield with its cathedral, so admirably described, as we might well expect, by Canon Bodington; the moor folk of the Peak country from the pen of Mr. J. P. Sheldon; as well as the world-famed Potteries, with its history so ably told by Mr. Percy W. L. Adams?

The volume itself is only edited by Mr. Beresford, but he himself contributes five out of the nineteen articles of which it is composed, the rest being supplied by fourteen separate contributors. It contains, as is usual in works of this kind, articles on such subjects as old families and castles, ancient tenures and religious foundations, old towers and spires, besides others of local interest. If Staffordshire is not rich in old castles, this certainly cannot be said of old families, of whom at least twelve seem to remain, many of them dating from Norman times; though why the Gresleys are included is not clear, seeing that their place and their property are both in Derbyshire. Perhaps even more remarkable still are the old oaks which remain to tell the tale of the old forests. This is well illustrated on p. 50, the Beggar's Oak and the Swilcar Oak both having figured, it is said, in Doomsday Book.

Sir Reginald Hardy contributes an interesting notice on some old tenures, among which the so-called jocular tenure of the Flitch of Bacon at Wichnor is certainly the most remarkable. Overshadowed by its more notorious rival at Dunmow, it surely shares with it, and with many other tenures here mentioned, the honour of being among the silliest things ever invented by the wit of man. The Flitch of Bacon tenure dates from the XIVth century, yet the flitch hangs in the hall at Wichnor to this day.

The chapter on the rise and progress of the Potteries will well repay perusal, while Canon Bodington's article on Lichfield is one of the best in the book. It is historical without being dry, which is more than can be said for some of the other contributions. Especially instructive is his account on p. 127 of the liturgical day in a mediaeval cathedral. The canonical hours are, however, still rung from the tower. Two other salient

points worthy of attention are, first, the greater damage done to the cathedral by the Puritans than was the case at the Reformation; and secondly, the genuineness of the revival under Charles II. This is especially true at Lichfield under Bishop Hackett.

Mr. Royds has a subject of rare interest in his 'Five Royal Free Chapels.' Their foundation dates in some cases from periods as far distant as 959, and their position seems to have been similar to that which we believe to be the case at the present time with the Chapel of St. Peter's Chains in the Tower, where the priest acknowledges no jurisdiction save that of the Crown. Somewhere in the early days of the last century they seem to have been subjected to the authority of the local diocesan.

Of deep interest to the naturalist is the admirable chapter by Mr. Wells Bladen on 'Historic Chartley,' for until recently the great park was the home of one of the herds of so-called wild white cattle, on the origin of which Professor Boyd Dawkins' lecture, quoted on p. 188, is perhaps the last word. Within the last six years this herd has become, alas, practically extinct. The cattle were sold and have come to grief. An attempt was made, which might have led to an experiment of unique interest, to try and persuade one of the purchasers of the broken-up herd to apply to its reconstitution the principles of genetics, but nothing, we believe, came of it; and we fear that what seem to have been unscientific principles of introducing new blood have now obliterated the type. The splendid illustration of p. 190 remains the only monument to a vanished past.

There is the usual article on Lichfield and Dr. Johnson; and lovers of Isaac Walton will find much to interest them in the chapter entitled, 'In Charles Cotton's Country.' We must not overlook Mr. Cope's charming little notice of the local fairies. It must seldom be anyone's good fortune to meet with first-hand evidence of these little peoples' doings, yet such seems to have been the case with Mr. Cope, who met a man who not only had seen them, but had spoken to them. It is sad to think that as scientific farming increases, so the fairies decrease; but it seems to be so. New manures applied to the soil destroy the little rings of fungi where the fairies dance, and when they find their ballroom has vanished, they vanish too.

The only article which might, we think, have been omitted, is that on p. 94 ff. It consists of extracts from the notes of a tour in the county by Miss Biddulph; and yet as it is, it gives the

layman, the amateur, an opportunity of realizing the amazing ingenuity of the archaeological mind. An excellent example of this quality appears on p. 95, where Miss Biddulph tries to persuade us that many of the heraldic signs, such as the Pale, the Bend, and the Bar, have their origin in the shape of the Staffordshire agricultural gates. Anyhow, it opens out a new and fascinating pursuit for the landlord, the tenant farmer, and the estate carpenter. Almost as amazing are the leaps of which Miss Biddulph's history is capable. On p. 102, for instance, she starts on line 6 from Biddulph, which is, we presume, home, five lines further on she reaches Godfrey de Bouillon, yet five lines more and she gets to the prophet Jeremiah. Thence she starts upon her return journey, at a more moderate speed, and finally, eleven lines further on, reaches Burton-on-Trent, *via* the Phoenicians and the Venetians. After all, Burton-on-Trent is in the same county as Biddulph, and so not really far off, but the pace fairly takes our breath away. We hardly know whether or not to feel sympathetic when, on p. 122, line 16, Miss Biddulph reaches the *Centre of All Things*, but we are in no doubt whatever when in the very next line she tells us that her pony and cart vanished as a dream, and it is distinctly reassuring to learn in the next line again that she has still sufficient energy left to put some heather in water—*and Go forward*. Miss Biddulph apparently loves capital letters.

The volume is charmingly bound and got up, the thirty-seven illustrations being, some of them, excellent; of especial interest being ancient ones of Lichfield Cathedral and Burton Abbey. The whole is dedicated to the present Bishop, and no more excellent dedication could have been made. Himself a member of one of the most illustrious and hard-working families in the county, he has both by his unfailing tact and simple piety endeared himself to the diocese in no ordinary way. Altogether we can confidently recommend the book to all lovers of the past.

Memorials of Old Yorkshire. Edited by T. M. Fallow, M.A., F.S.A. With many Illustrations. (London: George Allen and Sons. 1909.) 15s. net.

This beautiful volume is another of the series of 'County Memorials,' now being issued under the General Editorship of the Rev. P. H. Ditchfield. Yorkshire, having an area almost equal to that of Wales, and a past history of a most important and varied character, cannot be treated with

any degree of completeness in a work of this kind; ten different subjects are therefore dealt with by as many different writers, and a prospect of a companion volume is held out, where perhaps as many more may find a place. 'Prehistoric Yorkshire' is discussed in a brief survey by Mr. George Clinch, and 'Roman Yorkshire' at greater length by Mr. J. Norton Dickons. The account of the Roman roads by the latter writer is very complete, and there is a striking illustration of that which passes over Blackstone Edge. Dr. Cox describes the Royal Forests, pointing out that the word 'forest' originally meant a waste, and has only acquired its modern sense of a great wood from the fact that so many wastes have been covered with wood or undergrowth. The original sense, however, survives in some places where there is but little wood. York and its Minster are well described by the Rev. J. Solloway, who shews, by the way, that the Latin name Eboracum should be stressed on the penultimate, being derived from the old Celtic name Ebrauc, as is the English 'York,' thus, Ebraucum, Eboracum, Eoferic, Yorwik, York. A sequence concerning St. William has the line

'Eborācum presul redit,'

which preserves the proper accent and quantity. This article includes notices of the principal Parish Churches and other old buildings in York. 'The Village Churches of Yorkshire' are described in the longest article in the volume, by Mr. A. Hamilton Thompson, who takes the most remarkable of them in an order mainly chronological, and treats on them in a very interesting and instructive way. An adverse fate seems to pursue the famous inscription on the Kirkdale dial. We had lately to call attention to a most unlucky reading and translation of it; here we have (p. 112) an unfortunate misprint, 'let macanne wan' for 'let macan newan' = let make new. We think that the narrow openings over the earliest tower arches are not so rare as is stated, but we have nothing to offer by way of explanation of them. 'The Norman Doorways of Yorkshire' are described by Mr. Keyser in one of the longest articles in the book, and as the writer has long been recognized as a principal authority on Norman doorways, it is almost needless to say how well the work is done. It is, moreover, illustrated by no less than twenty-eight admirable photographic pictures. Among the most remarkable are those of St. Margaret's, Walmgate, York, with the signs of the zodiac and labours of the months, and Alne, with a bestiary, including

the names of the animals, without which there might be some difficulty in recognizing them. Next follows an account of Yorkshire Bells, by Mr. J. Eyre Poppleton. It is very difficult to get inscriptions rightly printed. The Scawton inscription is 'Campana Beate Marie,' not 'Beata Maria.' At Arncliffe the reading surely must be, 'ut intremus,' not 'intremis.' There are others that we might question. If they be wrong on the bell, they should be so given, but with a *sic*. The proper reading of the bell at Rylstone, referred to by Wordsworth, to whom had been sent the pleasing but erroneous reading, 'God us ayde,' was first published in the *Reliquary* some forty years ago. Mr. Poppleton has got together a great deal of interesting information, including a very complete account of the bell-founders. Mr. Hamilton Thompson, the *vates sacer* of the village churches, gives an excellent account of the castles, and Canon Nolloth writes *con amore* upon Beverley Minster. The last article, namely, that on 'Yorkshire Folklore,' by Miss W. M. E. Fowler, is both curious and amusing. We are afraid that the dialect is a little mixed. Would a Yorkshire woman say 'It *be* a fummard,' or 'When I were a *gal*'? Spine disease is called 'Spine i' t' back.' There is a Yorkshire story connected with the therapeutic action of leaden bullets which, perhaps, we could hardly expect to find in this article. These notes, written almost at random while looking through the volume, may at least serve to call attention to the nature of its very interesting contents. In a future volume room might perhaps be found not only for monastic history and remains, but for fonts, screens, glass, and sepulchral monuments, including brasses.

Trans-Himalaya. Discoveries and Adventures in Tibet. By Sven Hedin. Two Volumes. (Macmillan and Co. Ltd. 1909.) 30*s.* net.

This splendid work is a monument of heroic zeal and scientific exploration. The book takes its name from the Trans-Himalaya range which runs in Tibet north of the Tsangpo (Brahmaputra) and Indus rivers, and divides the basin of the former river on the south from the great Central Plateau of Tibet on the north. Leaving Leh, the capital of Western Tibet, in August 1906, Dr. Sven Hedin entered Chinese Tibet, and for nearly five months journeyed south-east over the great central tableland. This plateau contains no towns, and its only inhabitants are pastoral nomads. There is no drainage, as all its small rivers run

into lakes. After crossing range after range of barren mountains, the gallant traveller descended into the valley of the Brahmaputra (Tsangpo), and at last found himself among temples and houses. He was present at the great Buddhist festival of the New Year, which is held in the splendid monastery of Tashi-lunpo, near Shigatse. Here he saw one of the two supreme Buddhist popes of Tibet, the Tashi Lama, who resides in the monastery. The other is the Dalai Lama, who lives at Lhasa. All Tibetan Buddhism is subject to these two supreme pontiffs. Buddhism entered Tibet in the seventh century A.D., and incorporated into its ceremonial the pre-existing Shamanism and demon worship of the country. Dr. Sven Hedin, leaving Shigatse, went again northwards into the recesses of the Trans-Himalaya, and then travelled westwards up the valley of the Brahmaputra until he reached its source. Then he explored the holy lake of Mansarowar, of which he gives a beautiful water-colour picture. It is surrounded by mountains, on which there are many monasteries, which were visited by him, and of which he gives a graphic description. The lake is slowly drying up, and in its neighbourhood, the Indus, the Sutlej, and the Brahmaputra, all take their rise. Leaving the lake, Dr. Sven Hedin then made a circuit around the holy mountain of Kailas, which rises to the north, and is considered to be so holy that multitudes of Hindoos and Buddhists make pilgrimages to it every year. A barrier was now put to the traveller's further progress, for the Tibetan authorities forbade him to turn again eastwards, and to explore portions of the Trans-Himalaya which he had been unable to visit. Dr. Sven Hedin, however, was equal to the emergency. He formed a new caravan, and started for the north, up the valley of the Shyok, as if he intended to enter Chinese Tartary. When near the Karakoram pass, however, he suddenly turned to the east, and in the depth of winter once more entered the great Tibetan plateau. For many weeks he journeyed through a howling wilderness of ice and snow. The winter and spring (of 1908) were fearful, and it is a marvel that all his caravan did not perish. He himself assumed a disguise, and drove a flock of sheep to appear as a simple shepherd. Still he heroically struggled on, and crossing the plateau once more in a south-easterly direction, again reached the Brahmaputra.

The Tibetans discovered him, but permitted him to return by whatever road he chose. Having again explored unknown parts of the Trans-Himalaya, he finally left Tibet by the valley of

the Sutlej, and, descending the extraordinary series of gorges by which the river cuts a passage through the Himalayas, reached Simla.

The results of these journeys are most important. Dr. Sven Hedin has laid down accurately and mapped hundreds of miles of the Trans-Himalaya range, and has also discovered the sources of the Indus, the Sutlej, and the Brahmaputra. The information he gives of the Buddhist religion, of its festivals, monasteries, and pilgrimages is very valuable, and his water-coloured pictures of the shrines in these monasteries are most interesting. He gives a good character to the Tibetans, but they are the abject slaves of the Buddhist Lamas. Chinese power, however, is much increasing in Tibet, for China is now determining to make Tibet a regular province in her empire, and the Chinese troops have already crushed some of the greatest monasteries in Eastern Tibet. Chinese troops, also, have been sent recently to Lhasa to punish the Dalai Lama for attempting to negotiate treaties with foreign powers. These events, considering the awakening of China, may lead to the opening of Tibet to European commerce, and to Christian Missions.

We may add that Dr. Sven Hedin's book, besides being most beautifully illustrated, contains valuable maps and a most copious index.

Francis Atterbury. By H. C. Beeching, M.A., D.Litt. (London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons. 1909.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Atterbury has long been regarded as the typical political churchman, and his life as illustrating the grave danger to the spiritual interests of the Church which comes from the intervention of the clergy in party warfare. He has a conspicuous place in English history, at a time of constitutional crisis, which, it may be, has never been estimated according to its real importance. It was a time when the position of the Crown was extraordinarily difficult in relation to the party conflicts of the day, and Queen Anne has never been credited with the wisdom she really displayed, the restraint and prudence which set an example to her successors which only George III departed from, and Victoria and Edward VII have conspicuously observed. And the time affords another parallel to our own day—or it may be contrast; for it was a time of decision as to the position which bishops should occupy in secular affairs. In Anne's reign for the last time

a bishop discharged an important political function, while the relation of the Episcopate to the politics of the day was not stereotyped, as it was under the Georges, in subservience to the party discipline. It was a time when bishops could win the ear of the House of Lords—on foreign politics then, as later on financial questions—without being regarded as bound by party allegiance. Now Atterbury has been thought to be the man who changed all that. He became decisively Tory, and perhaps indecisively Jacobite, till exile forced him into the Pretender's arms. And the precedent he set was disastrously followed. It bore its fruit when, just before the Oxford Movement revived the spiritual energies of the Church, Lord Grey told the bishops to 'set their house in order.' Thus Atterbury, both as illustrating 'the meaning and influence of a cause which never succeeded' [we quote an editorial note explaining the object of this series of biographies of 'Makers of National History'], and as himself exercising a most powerful influence on constitutional custom, was well worthy to have his life fully written with all the advantages of modern scholarship. It is exactly this service which he has received from Dr. Beeching. With the Westminster Abbey manuscripts and rare books at his command, with Westminster traditions of its great Dean, and with personal familiarity with the scene of Atterbury's period of greatest activity, the canon of Westminster started on his task with every advantage. But he has not been content to use such material only, to walk (as it were) up that curious little staircase in the Deanery into the attic where ridiculous people have pictured the Dean engaged in imaginary secret interviews; but he has taken a broad view of the history and politics of the time, and while interested primarily in Atterbury as a man, and most delightfully restoring him to us in every familiar personal concern and aspect of his life, has set him in full light amid the political, ecclesiastical, and constitutional questions of his age. It is not necessary for us here to recall the familiar dates and events of Atterbury's life: we need only say that Dr. Beeching follows all closely, clearly, cleverly. He draws what it is hardly an exaggeration to call a perfect picture of the times and the man. The special points in the biography which strike us are: the very careful treatment of the history of Convocation at the period of its greatest public importance since the reign of Henry VIII, the light thrown on the position of a Dean of Westminster in relation to his chapter, the Jacobite intrigues and Atterbury's connexion with them, the conception which he had of the duties of a bishop, and a multitude of points,

small and great, with regard to the constitutional history of chapters, Carlisle and Christ Church as well as Westminster, and of patronage in England. We do not say that we always agree with Dr. Beeching's interpretations of facts, but one of the great merits of his book is that it always gives the facts (sometimes even the *facsimiles*), that we may interpret them for ourselves. The book, which is written with unusual charm of style, has some valuable appendices—we may particularize Atterbury's Directions in regard to Confirmation. It is a really important work, and should be read by all students of English history.

Memoirs of Bishop Seabury. By WILLIAM JONES SEABURY, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical Policy and Law in the General Theological Seminary, New York. (New York: E. S. Gorham. London: Rivingtons. 1909.) 10s. 6*d*.

No one could more fitly write the full biography of Bishop Seabury that was much needed (Dr. Beardsley's book has long been out of print, nor was it wholly satisfactory) than his descendant, whose distinction in the studies of history and theology peculiarly qualify him for the task. Dr. W. J. Seabury has abundant knowledge of eighteenth-century history, American and English; he has access to family materials, some at least of which, if we are not mistaken, have not hitherto been used; and he has a delightful sense of humour, which English ecclesiastical historians have too generally been deficient in or have shewn in the wrong place. Dean Stanley, *par exemple*, though his interest in history was so picturesque, was hardly justified in bursts of laughter when confronted with Bishop Seabury's mitre, regarded not unnaturally in America as 'a sacred relic': the Bishop's descendant says, quaintly: 'The amiable gentleman had probably never before seen a Mitre except on the recumbent effigies of his ancient Abbey, and he doubtless associated this one with a petrified Christianity. But Wisdom is justified of *all* her children.' It must be admitted, however, that the mitre was a curious one! it is described in a letter from Dr. Inglis, September 16, 1786, who had it made in London. As regards the family material, we have a great deal that is extremely interesting as shewing the liturgical and theological knowledge of the first American bishop and his shrewd judgements upon men and things. He speaks of a letter from Charles Wesley, 'who continues to lament the rash step taken by his doting, superannuated

brother' in ordination, and adds an epigram by Charles different from the one usually quoted—

> 'Wesley himself and friends betrays,
> By his own sense forsook;
> While suddenly his hands he lays
> On the hot head of *Coke*.'

The early history of the American Prayer Book is an interesting one, and it is very well given by Dr. Seabury. The agreement of the American bishop with his Scottish consecrators (November 15, 1784), is a valuable statement in regard to the celebration of the Eucharist, and should be compared with the Concordat between the two parties of the English Nonjurors, which was printed for the first time in *The Athenæum* in 1909.

The history of Bishop Seabury is not honourable to English churchmen. The attitude of Archbishop Moore was—one is not surprised to learn—strongly 'establishmentarian.' The courage and clear sightedness of the Scots is an agreeable contrast: they were, as Dr. Berkeley said, 'not shackled by any Erastian connexion,' but even at that date their position was not free from political danger. Dr. Seabury has written the life of his great-grandfather with all necessary completeness, and his book is essential to an understanding of the early history of the American Church. A man of great physical and moral courage and of bright intellectual clarity, Seabury was the very man to stamp his own impress on his followers in the ministry. His ordination in England, his consecration in Scotland, his pastoral works in Jamaica as well as in his own country, his political experiences as a loyalist, his religious achievements as a missionary of S.P.G. —all these prepared him to be the wise and good bishop that he became. Dr. Seabury is able also to present the Bishop to us in a new aspect, as a preacher. He analyzes some of his MS. sermons very clearly, and takes occasion to shew how very definite he was in his teaching that the Holy Communion is 'a continual sacrifice to God,' teaching as clear in 1754 as in 1793, and derived, as his family tradition shews, not from the Scottish Church but from 'Joseph Mede and other great lights of the Anglican Church on the Christian Sacrifice,' whose writings he had 'weighed in the balance with those of Tillotson and his revolutionary followers.' We have but hinted at the many lines of interest which may be followed in this valuable book.

The Archbishops of St. Andrews. Vols. I and II. By J. HERKLESS and R. K. HANNAY. (Edinburgh: Blackwood. 1907 and 1909.) 15s. net.

THE history of the Scottish Church before the Reformation has been much neglected. As the average Frenchman begins his history with the Revolution, so the average Scot is content with a vague and deep abhorrence of the period before Knox. Nor is he altogether wrong. Religion was practically dead, and there was no working system that could be reformed. A parochial organization could not exist when the revenues of the Church were vested almost wholly in a few monasteries and colleges or in the hands of the bishops. The working clergy had no sufficient maintenance till Charles I, the greatest practical benefactor of that Church, established the present system. And the wealth of the religious houses, a great part of which was appropriated to their heads, had led to their being regarded as endowments for noblemen or others of influence, with no thought of any spiritual duty attaching to them. Nor were the bishoprics, for the most part, better filled. Too often they were regarded merely as estates; of the first five Archbishops of St. Andrews two were boys, who did not live to be consecrated, one the brother and one the natural son of James IV, while the other three were thoroughly secular persons, though not of scandalous life. No loyalty or respect was felt for a Church so governed; and no reform was possible when the Scottish Church, even more than the English, was under the control of Rome at its worst. For the Scottish Church was far weaker, like the Scottish Crown, than the English. Cases which in England would have been retained for the national courts were referred to Rome, and the Curia was more active, and more successful, than with us in meddling with patronage. This was largely due to the anomalous position of the Church in Scotland. It had no Archbishop till 1472, and therefore no champion. The theoretical membership of the province of York, if it had not done much good, had at least excited little protest till the days of Robert Bruce. In many ways the two countries had been one; the great families had held lands in both, as also the abbeys had done, though the English lands of the Scottish houses were naturally more valuable than those held by English houses in the north. But when the alienation had set in, there was the mere shadow of a ruler in the person of a 'conservator,' chosen from among the bishops. When the primacy was established it was too late for reform. The story

is little more than one of political activity and the hunt for pluralities, with frequent defiance of ecclesiastical and even papal censures. The worst instance is that of the young Duke of Ross, made Archbishop at nineteen by his brother the King, who bestowed upon him the three great abbeys of Holyrood, Dunfermline, and Arbroath in exchange for the lands with which James III had endowed the Duke. The only Archbishop in whom we can take an interest is Andrew Forman, a self-made diplomatist who guided the policy of James IV during the few years in which he played a part in European politics. Vainly imagining that Scotland was a great power, Forman negotiated with Julius II and Leo X, who dangled before him a cardinal's hat, and with Louis XII, who actually gave him the see of Bourges, as he gave Tournai to Wolsey a little later. The King received the title of 'Protector of the Christian Religion,' and all seemed hopeful when the crash came at Flodden. There Alexander Stewart, whom his father had made Archbishop at thirteen, fell in arms. Henry VIII tried to induce Leo to subject Scotland once more to York, abolishing the archbishopric. The Pope refused, and after attempting in vain to secure the see for a boy-nephew of his own, fixed his choice on Forman. The Scots resisted for four years, but after a long course of negotiation and jobbery Forman gained his object, and ruled as a very capable prelate of the secular kind, whose concentration upon fees and patronage is to some extent redeemed by an interest in his little University. It is evident that his *Formulare*, from which considerable extracts are given, is a document worthy to be printed in full.

The whole story is melancholy, but we could wish that the authors did not dwell so often in homiletical style on its discreditable features. They are obvious enough, and Bishop Creighton has shewn how the period may be treated without comparison with a standard that was inconceivable in the XVth century. These volumes are to be followed by others in which the history of the archbishopric will be continued till its suppression. We trust that the writers, whose knowledge and skill is an honour to the Church of Scotland and the University of St. Andrews, will quickly complete their task. For English readers it is full of interest and instruction, in the resemblances and the differences of Scottish and English Church life which it shews. Without any Pharisaism we can be thankful that our own Church does not suffer in the contrast.

1. *The Life of Principal Rainy.* By PATRICK CARNEGIE SIMPSON, M.A. Two Volumes. (Hodder and Stoughton. 1909.) 21s.
2. *A Son of Knox and other Studies Antiquarian and Biographical.* By J. F. LEISHMAN, M.A. (Glasgow: James Maclehose and Sons. 1909.)
3. *The Aberdeen Doctors.* By D. MACMILLAN, M.A., D.D., Minister of Kelvinhaugh Parish, Glasgow. (Hodder and Stoughton. 1909.) 6s.
4. *Re-union: the Necessary Requirements of the Church of Scotland.* 'Scottish Church Society's Conferences.' Fourth Series. (Edinburgh: J. Gardner Hitt. 1909.) 1s.

THE group of publications, which are here brought together, varied in size and importance as they are, have a real bond of connexion, as bearing upon the problem of religious division and re-union in Scotland, which has recently formed the subject of a series of articles in this review.

The *Life of Principal Rainy* deals with a stirring and important figure in Scottish ecclesiastical controversy during the last fifty or sixty years, whose strong individuality was the focus of many antipathies and as many enthusiasms. More than any other personality, Rainy was the embodiment of the spirit of the Free Church in almost all the phases of its history, from the Disruption of 1843 to its absorption in the United Free Church by the union of 1901. His day rose and set in storm. 'That year made me a minister,' Rainy himself said of the famous '43. And the hour of apparent triumph in which he took the Moderator's Chair of the first assembly of the United Free Church was succeeded almost immediately by the sensational legal proceedings that issued in a judgement of the House of Lords which threw Scotland into an ecclesiastical turmoil only second to that in which the Free Church had been born. It was the element of strife both in the Principal's own character and in the circumstances of his career which, in spite of the calm, subtle, diplomatic bearing which caused men often, though without sufficient justice, to doubt his sincerity, made him at the same time the stormy petrel of the Scottish ecclesiastical heavens, the symbol of divisive dissidence rather than of pacific re-union.

The two bulky volumes which Mr. Carnegie Simpson has given us are the work of an ardent disciple, who also desires to be the apologist of his Church. The man and the society of

which he was the protagonist are in the nature of things closely linked, and in the case of Dr. Rainy a close identification was inevitable. But far too much of the second volume is devoted to a detailed examination of the arguments of counsel and the deliverances of the judges in the House of Lords. After all, the judgement is now a matter of history, and a criticism of the *obiter dicta* which preceded it has very little interest even as apologetic. And indeed, with every attempt to adopt the rôle of an impartial critic, the biographer, both in this part of his narrative and in his estimate of the part played by his subject in successive controversies, is obviously far too much swayed by the desire to set the Free Church right in the eyes of the world. He succeeds in vindicating the Principal on the charge of astute and worldly diplomacy, always too readily levelled at statesmanship whether in civil or spiritual affairs. But he does not, we think, remove the impression of a combative and self-conscious impatience, which, with all its evangelical zeal and theological scholarship, has sadly marred the progress of the Free Church. We are quite willing to concede the sincerity of the campaign of disestablishment which was an unpleasant feature of religious life in Scotland during the 'Eighties. But we cannot think Mr. Simpson happy in his endeavour to find in the Patronage Act of 1874, and the events which led up to it, a sufficient justification for the exasperating controversy which embittered the relations of Scottish Christians, and cast a suspicion, not yet wholly removed, upon the policy of union between the two great bodies of Scottish dissenters. If subsequent events afford any just estimate of the movement, the striking contrast between the apparent imminence of disestablishment in 1892 and the almost academic interest in the subject displayed by Liberal politicians during the recent elections is the best reply to a perfervid agitation. If disestablishment eventually comes, the manner of its accomplishment will be very different from what was once anticipated. Meanwhile, it is gratifying to record how the vision of a wider re-union than that which a few years ago was accomplished with much strain and stress took shape in the mind of Dr. Rainy, and how greatly changed, chastened perhaps by adversity, is the temper of the United Free Church to-day. At the same time it cannot be denied that, to those who look for a union broader than that of Scottish Presbyterianism, the Church to the welfare of which Dr. Rainy devoted his great powers presents fewer points of sympathetic contact than its Established sister.

The other books, though of a much slighter character than the *Life* of which we have been speaking, introduce us to a very different atmosphere. All emanate from the Established Church, and are typical of that reverence for history, broader outlook, and kindled imagination, which represent the revival from moderatism within its borders, as perhaps the quickening of evangelical fervour represents the same reaction among Free Churchmen. Generalizations are always imperfect, but on the whole it would be true to say that a discriminating appreciation of the whole heritage of Scottish religion, as distinguished from a renewed apprehension of the peculiar witness of the Reformation, is a gift of the modern Established Church. Moderatism, after all, has its good side, and it was the characteristic fault of the Disruption fathers not to see this. Enthusiasm can ride off on principles, but it requires culture to mate principles with facts.

The papers, which Mr. Leishman has gathered together in a small volume of *Studies*, exhibit that sympathy with the whole history of Scotland which is large enough to include those elements in the national development, upon which Puritans and Covenanters looked askance, and which is essential to a due estimate of the personalities and of the forces, religious and social, that have made the post-Reformation history of the country. Mr. Leishman, though a loyal minister of the Established Church of Scotland and an ex-Moderator to boot, does not use the spectacles of a blue Presbyterianism.

The Aberdeen Doctors receive at the hands of Dr. Macmillan in his 'Hastie Lectures' a fair and just treatment, which they have too rarely received, and which ought to do much to obtain for them that recognition which their sound learning and reasonable spirit eminently demand. They have never been without honour among Scottish Episcopalians, who with pardonable pride have always looked to Aberdeen as the home of a theology more tolerant, because more historical, than that which has been too often dominant in the North; but with Scotsmen generally they have wellnigh passed into oblivion. Among them, or at any rate closely connected with them, was Dr. William Forbes, whose *Considerationes Modestae* were included in the 'Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology.' But the greatest of them was John Forbes, who had a universal reputation among the scholars of his time. It would scarcely be correct to describe the 'Doctors' as High Churchmen. Their position was more akin to that of the learned Archbishop Ussher than to that of the Laudian divines.

They were not prelatists, but they agreed in regarding the ecclesiastical life of Scotland as wider than the theories into which many of their contemporaries were seeking to confine it. But for the prelatic policy of the Stuart kings, their influence might have combined with that of Leighton, who to some extent inherited their spirit, in procuring such a settlement of religion as would have united the various parties in a church polity at once catholic and comprehensive. We should doubt whether Dr. Macmillan had grasped all that the inheritance of such a spirit might imply in relation to the modern problem of re-union. His view is not entirely that, for example, of the Scottish Church Society. But he has done good service in suggesting a fresh examination of their writings.

The Scottish Church Society's Conference of last year on the subject of re-union, undertaken as it was in view of the negotiations opened between the two General Assemblies, sets forth what, in the judgement of the Society, are the necessary requirements of the Church of Scotland. Security for continuity in creed and polity is what is mainly emphasized, and a determination not to close the door to yet wider unions by indifference to points, on which it is not necessary to insist with a view to the more immediate reconciliation between Presbyterians, such, for example, as the principle of ministerial succession. It is needless to add that this is regarded by the Society as an inalienable portion of their inheritance independently of all questions of re-union.

Periodicals.

The Journal of Theological Studies (Vol. XI. No. 42. January 1910. Frowde). W. Sanday: 'The Cambridge Biblical Essays.' C. H. Turner: 'Historical Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the N.T. V. The Languages of the Early Church: (B) Syriac and the first Syriac Gospels.' E. F. Morison: 'The Relation of Priest and Prophet in the History of Israel before the Exile.' S. Gaselee: 'Notes on the Coptic Version of the LXX.' F. C. Burkitt: 'St. Augustine's Bible and the *Itala*.' Right Rev. C. West-Watson (Bishop of Barrow): 'The Peraean Ministry.' H. Thurston, S.J.: 'The Early Cultus of the Reserved Eucharist.' Discusses Greg. Naz. *Orat.* viii. 18 in reply to *C.Q.R.* Oct. 1909. Right Rev. E. C. Butler: 'The Rule of St. Benedict. I. The Benevento MS. [Barberini xi. 64 in the Vatican]. II. St. Benedict and the *Duae Viae*.' M. R. James: (1) 'Notes on Apocrypha. I. *Revelatio Thomae*. II. Syriac Apocrypha in Ireland'; (2) 'Two more MSS. written by the scribe of the Leicester Codex.' MSS. C. C. C. Oxon. 76–77 (Suidas *Lexicon*), and 19 (Psalter), and the writer Emmanuel of Constantinople who worked for Archbishop Neville of York († 1476). J. H. Moulton: 'Thackeray

Grammar of the O.T. in Greek, I' (7 pp. laudatory). W. E. Crum: 'Thompson *Coptic (Sahidic) Version of Certain Books of the O.T.*' C. A. Scott: '*Jesus or Christ?*' [*H.J.* Supplement, 1909]. H. L. Jackson: 'A. Müller *Geschichtskerne in den Evangelien*'; 'Clemen *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des N.T.*' A. H. McNeile: 'v. Dobschütz *Thessalonians.*' S. Liberty: 'J. B. Mayor *Jude and II. Peter.*' R. H. Connolly: 'Bedjan *Mar Isaaci Ninevitae De Perfectione Religiosa.*' Right Rev. A. J. Maclean (Bishop of Moray): 'Connolly *Liturgical Homilies of Narsai.*'

The Hibbert Journal (Vol. VIII. No. 2. January 1910. Williams and Norgate). F. von Hügel: 'Father Tyrrell. Some Memorials of the last Twelve Years of his Life.' C. E. Osborne: 'George Tyrrell. A Friend's Impressions.' H. Jones: 'Tennyson.' E. B. Clapp: 'Greek Religion and Morality as set forth by Pindar.' K. C. Anderson: 'The Collapse of Liberal Christianity.' P. T. Forsyth: 'Orthodoxy, Heterodoxy, Heresy, and Freedom.' 'An Evangelical Layman': 'Divorçons!' A. Gehring: 'Grounds of Faith. A Study of Likelihoods.' E. König: 'Faith and Knowledge.' E. F. Carritt: 'Truth in Art and in Religion.' R. L. Gales: 'Catholicism and Happiness.' R. R. Marett: 'Savage Supreme Beings and the Bull-Roarer.' W. A. Ross and G. W. Allen: 'Self-assertion in Nietzsche and Self-surrender in Boehme. A Contrast and an Identity.' Discussions. W. R. Inge: 'Tyrrell *Christianity at the Cross-Roads.*' J. Seth: 'R. L. Ottley *Christian Ideas and Ideals.*' A. Duff: 'J. A. Picton *Man and the Bible.*' E. Bullough: 'Ainslie *Benedetto Croce's Aesthetic.*' L. Solomon: 'Moffatt *Meredith.*' A. Wolf: 'H. MacColl *Man's Origin, Destiny and Duty.*' G. E. Underhill: 'Prichard *Kant's Theory of Knowledge*' (critical). G. Galloway: 'Boyce Gibson *God with us.*' H. C. Corrance: 'M. Hébert *Le Divin* and *La Forme idéaliste du sentiment religieux.*'

The London Quarterly Review (No. 225. January 1910. R. Culley). J. Telford: 'New Light on the Character of Wesley.' C. Kernahan: 'Conversations with Mr. Swinburne.' G. F. S. Atkinson: 'Sunday School Reform.' C. Bone: 'The New Education in China.' D. Macfadyen: 'Rudolf Eucken on Religion and History.' T. H. S. Escott: 'Greek as it was and is.' T. A. Seed: 'The Life of J. H. Rigg.' H. W. Clark: 'The Standpoint for a Doctrine of the Atonement.' J. Telford: 'Dr. Rainy's Leadership.' W. T. Davison: 'Galloway *Principles of Religious Development.*' R. W. Moss: 'Hughes *Ethics of Jewish Apocryphal Literature.*' J. G. Tasker: 'R. Otto *Goethe and Darwin* and *Darwinism and Religion.*' 'Tyrrell *Christianity at the Cross-Roads.*' 'Zahn *Introduction to the N.T.*' 'Stanton *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, II.' 'Ottley *Christian Ideas and Ideals.*' 'A. S. Lewis *Horae Semiticae*, VIII.' 'Swete *The Holy Spirit in the N.T.*' 'Gwatkin *Early Church History.*' '*Autobiography of Sir H. M. Stanley*' ('absorbing'). 'W. B. Cross *Life and Times of Sterne.*' 'Ballard *Eddyism.*'

The Dublin Review (Vol. CXLVI. No. 292. January 1910. Burns and Oates). W. Barry: 'Challoner.' W. Ward: 'The Ethics of Strong Language.' V. M. Crawford: 'Unemployment and its Remedies.' A. Meynell: 'Tennyson.' (The late) F. Thompson: 'Ecclesiastical Ballads.' Two Poems. W. Wilberforce: 'The Oriel Noetics.' C. C. Martindale, S.J.: 'New Learning.' B. de Courson: 'The Martyrs of Cambrai.' J. de Ghellinck, S.J.: 'The *Liber Sententiarum.*' H. Belloc: 'The International. I. The Ferrer Case.' Marquis de Chambrun: 'The French Bishops and the Education Problem.' 'Belloc *Marie Antoinette*' (laudatory). 'Wood *John Keble.*' 'W. J. Sparrow-Simpson *Roman Catholic Opposition to Papal Infallibility*' (critical). F. Y. E[ccles]: 'T. H. Warren *Essays of Poets and Poetry.*' 'Thackeray *Grammar of the O.T. in Greek*, I.' 'Reade *Moral System of Dante's Inferno.*' 'The new Roman Catholic *Hymn Book*' (very critical). 'Lowndes *The Nuns of*

Port Royal.' 'Le Roy *La Religion des Primitifs.*' 'Zahn *Introduction to the N.T.*'

The Irish Church Quarterly Review (Vol. III. No. 9. January 1910. Dublin: 61 Middle Abbey Street). Bishop of Ossory: 'Modern Mysticism.' Ven. W. Sherlock: 'The Story of the Revision of the Irish Prayer Book, I.' C. H. A. Field: ''A Muhammadan Theologian. Al Ghazzali.' T. S. Berry: 'The Atonement.' 'Driver *Modern Research as illustrating the Bible.*' 'Booth *Discovery and Decipherment of the Trilingual Cuneiform Inscriptions.*' 'Caldecott *The Second Temple in Jerusalem.*' 'Illingworth *Doctrine of the Trinity.*' 'Figgis *The Gospel and Human Needs.*' H. J. L[awlor]: 'Costello *De Annatis Hiberniae. I. Ulster.*' 'Seymour *Succession of Parochial Clergy in the united Diocese of Cashel and Emly.*'

The Irish Theological Quarterly (Vol. IV. No. 17. January 1910. Dublin: M. H. Gill). J. M. Harty: 'Historical Evolution of the Catholic Teaching on Usury.' L. J. Walker, S.J.: 'Truth and Toleration.' M. J. O'Donnell: 'The Seal of Confession.' B. Jarrett: 'A Thirteenth Century Revision Committee of the Bible.' G. R. Roche, S.J.: 'Eternal Punishment.' J. MacRory: 'The Teaching of the N.T. on Divorce.' P. Forde: 'MacCaffrey *History of the Catholic Church in the XIXth Century* (1789–1908).' J. MacRory: 'Swete *The Holy Spirit in the N.T.*'; 'Plummer *St. Matthew.*' J. MacCaffrey: 'Hergenröther *Handbuch der Allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte*, IV'; 'T. O'Donnell *The Priest To-day. His Ideals and his Duties*'; 'M. de Wulf *History of Medieval Philosophy*' [E.T.] P. Boylan: 'O'Sullivan *Old Criticism and New Pragmatism.*' P. Coffey: 'Mausbach *Die Ekik des hl. Augustinus*, I' ('thorough'). M. J. O'Donnell: 'Gardeil *Le Donné Révélé et la Théologie*' and 'Mgr. Mignot (Archevêque d'Albi) *L'Église et la Critique.*'

The Interpreter (Vol. VI. No. 2. January 1910. Simpkin, Marshall). W. Emery Barnes: 'The Sacrifice of Isaac.' O. C. Whitehouse: 'The Condition of Egypt and Western Asia, 1700–1200 B.C.' E. R. Buckley: 'The Chronology of St. Mark's Gospel.' H. Bulcock: 'The Influence on St. Paul of the Religions of Asia Minor.' E. Davies: 'The Death of Saul.' C. A. Miles: 'Matthew Arnold and Catholic Modernism.' H. W. Hogg: 'Orientalia.' H. Johnson: 'Toffteen *The Historic Exodus.*' 'Orchard *Modern Theories of Sin.*'

The American Journal of Theology (Vol. XIV. No. 1. January 1910. Chicago University Press). W. H. P. Faunce: 'The Religious Function of Public Worship.' J. H. Tufts, E. W. Lyman, and E. H. Sneath: 'The Ultimate Test of Religious Truth. Is it Historical or Philosophical?' J. A. Faulkner: 'The First Great Christian Creed.' J. C. Granbery: 'Christological Peculiarities in 1 Peter.' C. H. Dickinson: 'Some Wholesome Humiliations of the Modern Church.' G. D. Walcott: 'Theological Reconstruction. A Practicable Programme.' J. H. Breasted: 'A. H. Gardiner *The Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage*' [Ipuwer. From Pap. Leiden. 344 r°]. 'W. Otto *Priester u. Tempel im hellenistischen Aegypten.*' J. M. P. Smith: 'Popular Biblical Studies.' G. H. Gilbert: 'Hoennicke *Das Judenchristenthum im ersten u. zweiten Jahrhundert*'; 'Klein *Derälteste Christliche Katechismus u. die jüdische Propaganda-Literatur*' [The Didache]; 'Schechter *Aspects of Rabbinical Theology.*' C. Clemen: 'Friedländer *Synagoge u. Kirche in ihren Anfängen*'; 'Bousset *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis.*' S. Mathews: 'Clemen *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des N.T.*' E. Gates: 'J. W. Richard *The Confessional History of the Lutheran Church.*' G. A. Coe: 'R. M. Jones *Studies in Mystical Religion.*' G. B. Smith: 'Hunziger *Probleme u. Aufgabe der gegenwärtigen systematischen Theologie.*' D. C. Macintosh: 'Saintyves *Le discernement du miracle*'; 'Fonsegrive *Essais sur la Connaissance*'; 'Dunkmann *System theologischer Erkenntnislehre.*' J. B. Pratt: 'F. B. Jevons *Introduction to the Study of Comparative Religion*'; 'A. L. Strong

The Psychology of Prayer.' G. Hodges: 'F. Spence *Christian Reunion*'; 'C. A. Briggs *Church Unity.*' A. K. Parker: 'C. H. Hall *Christ and the Eastern Soul*'; 'L. Joly *Le problème des missions. Tribulations d'un vieux chanoine*'; 'R. Allies *Le protestantisme au Japon* (1859–1907).'

The Princeton Theological Review (Vol. VIII. No. 1. January 1910. Princeton University Press). C. W. Hodge: 'Christian Experience and Dogmatic Theology.' S. Angus: 'The Koiné, the Language of the N.T.' C. R. Morey: 'The Origin of the Fish-symbol,' I. Reduces the possible meanings to three, 'the word-play of the acrostic, the baptismal allusion, and the eucharistic significance.' W. M. Jack: 'D. Graham *The Grammar of Philosophy*' ('brilliant'). '*New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, IV. *Draeseke to Goa.*' W. B. Greene, jr.: 'G. B. Foster *The Function of Religion in Man's Struggle for Existence*'; 'F. J. Lamb *Miracle and Science*' (Bible miracles examined by legal methods); 'v. Haering *Ethics of the Christian Life*'; 'E. T. Devine *Misery and its Causes*' (by the general secretary of C. O. S. of City of New York, Professor of Social Economy at Columbia University). E. H. Kellogg: 'R. M. Wenley *Modern Thought and Crises in Belief*' (5 pp.). K. D. Macmillan: 'Gressmann *Altorientalische Texte u. Bilder zum A.T.*'; 'Kehr *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, I–III' ('monumental'); 'H. Bruce *The Age of Schism* (1304–1503)'; 'W. H. Hutton *The Age of Revolution* (1648–1815).' J. O. B[oyd]: 'J. O. Boyd *The Octateuch in Ethiopic.*' W. P. Armstrong: 'Radau *Bel, the Christ of Ancient Times*'; 'Heinrici *Des Petrus von Laodicea Erklärung des Matthäus-evangeliums*'; 'Zahn *Introduction to N.T.*' (with long list of errata). W. H. Johnson: 'Harnack *The Sayings of Jesus. The Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke*' [E. T.] (5½ pp). J. G. Machen: 'F. G. Lewis *The Irenaeus Testimony to the Fourth Gospel.*' H. E. Dosker: 'Cramer-Pijper *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica*, V.' B. B. Warfield: 'Doumergue *Iconographie Calvinienne*'; 'A. Schultze *Christian Doctrine and Systematic Theology*' (A Moravian work); 'W. N. Clarke *Sixty Years with the Bible. A Record of Experience.*'

The Expositor (N.S. Nos. 49–51. January–March 1910. Hodder and Stoughton). A. Macalister: 'The Personal Religion of an Evolutionist.' Murtle Lecture at Aberdeen, Nov. 1909. S. R. Driver: 'The Method of Studying the Psalter, with special application to some of the Messianic Psalms,' I. (Feb. II. 'Ps. xlv. An Ode celebrating a Royal Marriage.' March. III. 'Ps. cx.'). D. S. Margoliouth: 'Studies in the Sermon on the Mount. I. The Beatitudes' (Feb. II. 'The "Completion" of the Law.' March. III. 'The Composition of a Gospel'). Sir W. M. Ramsay: 'The Epitaph of M. Julius Eugenius, Bishop of Laodicea.' J. Orr: 'Sin as a Problem of To-day. I. Nature and Magnitude of the Problem' (Feb. II. 'Sin as a Moral Transgression—The Primary Certainties.' March. III. 'Sin and the Divine Holiness—The Moral End'). J. H. Moulton: 'Some New Subjects of Theological Study.' E. H. Askwith: 'The Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel. VI. The Resurrection' (Feb. VII. 'The Resurrection' (2). March. VIII. 'Cleansing of the Temple—Feeding of the Five Thousand—Walking on the Sea'.) February. E. v. Dobschütz: 'The Eschatology of the Gospels. I. The Problem and its History.' (March. II. 'Various Tendencies in Transmission—The Eschatological Stock of Jesus-Tradition'). R. H. Strachan: 'The Christ of the Fourth Gospel.' Sir W. M. Ramsay: 'Historical Commentary on 1 Timothy' (*continued*). G. A. J. Ross: 'The Indispensableness of Jesus.' March. C. W. Emmet: 'Galatians the Earliest of the Pauline Epistles.' J. Ll. Davies: 'St. Paul's Beliefs. Some Reconciliations.' J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan: 'Lexical Notes from the Papyri' (*continued*).

The Expository Times (Vol. XXI. Nos. 4–6. January–March 1910. T. and T. Clark). '*Cambridge Biblical Essays.*' '*Jesus or Christ?*' P. J. Maclagan: 'Taoism, its Christian Affinities and its Defects,' I. (Feb.

II. March. III.). W. T. Whitley: 'Luke of Antioch in Pisidia.' J. C. Todd: 'The Logia of the Baptist.' W. W. Holdsworth: 'The Life of Faith.' T. H. Weir: 'John ii. 19.' C. J. Ball: 'Cushan-rishathaim' (Judg. iii. 7–11). 'G. H. Morrison *The Return of the Angels.*' '*Cambridge History of English Literature*, IV.' 'Wirgman *Life of James Green, Dean of Maritzburg.*' 'Sparrow Simpson *Roman Catholic Opposition to Papal Infallibility.*' 'O. Carey *History of Christianity in Japan.*' 'Wolferstan *The Catholic Church in China.*' 'G. W. E. Russell *Sir Wilfrid Lawson.*' February. A. Wright: 'Professor Stanton on the Synoptic Problem.' Very Rev. J. L. Darby (Dean of Chester): 'Is there no Atonement?' R. M. Pope: 'Studies in Pauline Vocabulary. III. Of Boldness of Speech (2 Cor. iii. 12).' '*Recent Christian Progress*' (edited by L. B. Paton). H. R. Mackintosh: 'J. de la Servière *La Théologie de Bellarmin.*' (The late) W. R. Morfill: 'Grass *Die Russischen Sekten*, ii. 1.' 'Saint Cyres *Pascal.*' '(The late) F. Thompson *St. Ignatius Loyola.*' 'W. M. Ramsay *The Thousand and One Churches.*' '*New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia*, IV–V' (critical). 'Montefiore *The Synoptic Gospels* I.–II.' 'J. Rendel Harris *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon.*' 'E. E. Anderson *St. Matthew*' (with a very elaborate index). 'Bompas *Folklore of the Santal Parganas.*' March. Sir W. M. Ramsay: 'The Authorities for the Institution of the Eucharist,' I (important). J. E. McFadyen: 'The Centralization of Israel's Worship.' W. R. Thompson: 'J. Leckie *Authority in Religion.*' G. R. Macphail: 'A Gaelic Gloss from Bobbio' (In Columban's Psalter, Ps. xviii. 36, 'weariness comes not to my bones though I travel firmly and for ever'). C. J. Ball: 'John ii. 19.' A. B. Kinsey: 'The Triumph-Joy.' T. W. Davies: '"Stones of Rolling."' N. Crooke: 'The Camel and the Eye of the Needle' (illustrated from Sir H. M. Elliot's *History of India*, III. 553). J. H. Moulton: '"The Marks of Jesus."' 'P. Gardner *Modernity and the Churches.*' 'H. E. Sampson *Progressive Redemption.*' 'Boutroux *Science and Religion in Contemporary Philosophy.*' 'Henson *The Liberty of Prophesying.*' '*Annual of the British School at Athens.*' 'Headlam *History, Authority and Theology.*'

The Churchman (N.S. Vol. XXIV. Nos. 49–51. January–March 1910. E. Stock). Very Rev. H. Wace (Dean of Canterbury): '1910.' H. Hensley Henson: 'Jesus or Christ?' A. J. Tait: 'The Holy Communion as a Sacrifice.' D. T. Young: 'Home Reunion. A Wesleyan Outlook.' W. S. Hooton: 'The Church and the World-Power.' A. J. Santer: 'The Missionary World' (*continued* Feb.–March). J. Orr: 'Simpson *Life of Principal Rainy.*' F. S. G. Warman: 'Zahn *Introduction to N.T.*' W. E. Chadwick: 'Ottley *Christian Ideas and Ideals*' (laudatory). W. H. Griffith Thomas: 'Plummer *St. Matthew*' ('masterly'). 'Maclear and Williams *Introduction to the Articles*' (critical). 'J. D. Thompson *The Doctrine of Immortality.*' '*Handbooks of English Church History*, I–II.' 'Forsyth *The Cruciality of the Cross.*' March. Very Rev. H. Wace: 'The Relation of the Ministry to Church and State.' H. Hensley Henson and W. H. M. H. Aitken: 'Bishop Gore's *Orders and Unity.*' Lt.-Col. G. Mackinlay: 'The Date of the Crucifixion' (A.D. 29). T. A. Gurney: 'The Divine Authority of Holy Scripture.' C. Courtney: 'A Good Sermon, but——' H. M. Sanders: 'The Temptation of Christ.' W. H. Griffith Thomas: 'Gwatkin *Early Church History*' ('absolutely indispensable'). J. Orr: '*Temple Dictionary of the Bible.*' 'F. E. Carter *Preaching.*'

The Catholic World (Vol. XC. Nos. 538–40. January–March 1910. New York). H. Hull: 'A Catholic Principle and the Criticism of Socialism.' C. Phillips: 'The Year's Catholic Poetry.' T. P. McLoughlin: 'A Visit to Mexico.' W. Sargent: 'Balfour *Personal and Literary Letters of the First Earl of Lytton.*' W. Wilberforce: '(The late) F. Thompson *St. Ignatius Loyola.*' 'Janssen *History of the*

German People, XIII.–XIV.' February. J. J. Walsh: 'Religion and Health.' M. L. Storer: 'The War against Religion in France.' Dom B. Camm: 'Stonor Park and its Martyrs.' '*Catholic Encyclopaedia*, VI.' 'G. M. Trevelyan *Garibaldi and the Thousand*.' March. W. Turner: 'The Celtic Element in Philosophy.' W. Elliott: 'Mother Mary Veronica of the Poor Clares.' G. M. Searle: 'Raupert *The Supreme Problem*.' K. Brégy: 'Coventry Patmore.' F. Meehan: 'The First American Cardinal' (J. McCloskey). 'F. G. Peabody *The Approach to the Social Question*.' 'E. N. Burton *Life of Bishop Challoner* (1690–1781).' 'P. Allard *S. Sidoine Apollinaire*.' 'M. J. Rivière *The Doctrine of the Atonement*' [E.T.]. 'Vacandard *Études de Critique et d'Histoire Religieuse*.'

The Edinburgh Review (No. 431. January 1910. Longmans). 'Industry and Employment.' 'Lorenzo de' Medici.' 'Pitt and the Triple Alliance (1781–91).' 'Molière.' 'The Tercentenary of the Telescope.' 'The Referendum.' 'The Tyranny of the Nile.' 'Governor Pitt.' 'Edgar Allen Poe.' 'L'Empire Libéral.'

The Quarterly Review (No. 422. January 1910. Murray). 'Byron and Bonaparte.' 'The National Archives.' 'Jacopone da Todi: the Poet of the *Stabat Mater*.' C. F. Burney: 'Ancient Jerusalem.' With Map. Sir H. H. Johnston: 'The Rise of the Native.' S. Reynolds: 'What the Poor Want.' W. S. Lilley: 'Democracy in Switzerland.' P. Lubbock: 'George Meredith.' R. Fry: 'Oriental Art.' Sir C. W. Dilke, Bart.: 'Before and After the Descent from Elba.' 'Angus.'

The English Historical Review (Vol. XXV. No. 97. January 1910. Longmans). C. H. M. Archibald: 'The Serfs of Sainte Geneviève.' J. K. Fotheringham: 'Genoa and the Fourth Crusade.' C. L. Kingsford: 'The Early Biographies of Henry V.' O. H. Richardson: 'Religious Toleration under the Great Elector and its Material Results.' F. C. Conybeare: 'Newly Discovered Letters of Dionysius of Alexandria to the Popes Stephen and Xystus' (in Armenian). H. E. Salter: 'A Charter of Stephen of January 1139.' In the Cartularies of Lincoln Cathedral, A. 1. 5, Charter 187. E. Curtis: 'The Clan System among English Settlers in Ireland.' R. J. Whitwell: 'An Ordinance for Syon Library, 1482.' P. S. Allen: 'A Dispensation of Julius II for Erasmus' (Vat. Archives Reg. Later 1174 f. 345, v°). A. F. Pollard: 'The Coronation of Q. Elizabeth.' W. C. Abbott: 'The Origin of Titus Oates' Story.' D. K. Broster: 'An English Sailor among the Chouans' (Capt. John Wesley Wright, 1796). W. A. Goligher: 'G. F. Hill *Historical Roman Coins*.' A. Gardner: 'Bigg *Origins of Christianity*.' E. W. Watson: '*Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclésiastique*, I'; 'Zoepf *Das Heiligenleben im 10 Jahrhundert*.' E. W. Brooks: 'E. Mayer *Italienische Verfassungsgeschichte von der Gothenzeit bis zur Zunftherrschaft*.' H. M. Bannister: 'Gasquet and Bishop *The Bosworth Psalter*.' F. M. Powicke: Prou *Recueil des Actes de Philippe Ier*' (1059–1108); 'Mirot *Chronique de Morigny*' (1095–1152). G. T. Lapsley: 'The Great Roll of the Pipe, 1179–80.' T. F. Tout: 'Delachenal *Histoire de Charles V*' (5½ pp.); 'Moris *L'Abbaye de Lérins*'; 'Lot *Mélanges d'Histoire bretonne*' (St. Malo). P. S. Allen: 'Schoengen *Jacobus Trajecti Narratio de inchoatione Domus Clericorum in Zwollis*.' J. P. Whitney: 'J. Morison *Reginald Pecock's Book of Faith*.' G. Unwin: ''Davidson and Gray *The Scottish Staple at Veere*.' L. M. Brandin: 'Hauser *Sources de l'Histoire de France* (1494–1610).' R. Graham: 'Salter *Subsidy Collected in the Diocese of Lincoln* (1526).' E. Armstrong: 'Nouillac *Villeroy* (1543–1610).' O. Wardrop: 'Waliszewski *Les premiers Romanov* (1613–82).' F. Harrison: 'C. H. Firth *Last Years of the Protectorate* (1656–58).' 'H. Hall *Studies in English Official Historical Documents*' (critical). 'Luchaire *Innocent III*.' F. E. B[rightman]: 'W. M. Kennedy *The "Interpretations" of the Bishops and their Influence on Elizabethan Episcopal Policy*.' C. T. A[tkinson]:

'W. Wood *Logs of the Conquest of Canada*.' 'Mgr. B. Ward *Dawn of the Catholic Revival in England* (1781–1803).'

The Economic Review (Vol. XX. No. 1. January 1910. Rivingtons). F. W. Bussell: 'The Landlord.' E. V. Birchall: 'The Conditions of Distress.' D. A. Barker: 'India and the Opium Traffic.' H. W. B. Joseph: 'Karl Marx's Theory of Value.' J. L. Dougan: 'Legislation, Parliamentary Inquiries, and Official Returns.' A. H. Johnson: 'Hasbach *History of the English Agricultural Labourer*' [E.T.]. J. St. G. Heath: 'J. A. Hobson *The Industrial System*.' J. E. Hannay: 'Hilquitt *Socialism in Theory and Practice*'; 'R. C. Chapin *The Standard of Living in New York City*.' D. A. Barker: 'St. Leger *Australian Socialism*'; 'E. G. Murphy *The Basis of Ascendancy*.' H. W. Wolff: 'Martin et Martenot *La Côte d'Or. Étude d'Économie Rurale*'; 'Ryan *Salaire et Droit à l'Existence*' (French trans. of a work by an American Roman Catholic Professor); 'F. Dubief *L'Apprentissage et l'Enseignement Technique*' (by a former Minister of Commerce); 'Bellom *Les Lois d'Assurance ouvrière à l'étranger*.' E. P. Swain: 'Sombart *Socialism and the Social Movement*'; 'Chadwick *Social Principles of the Gospel* and *Social Work*.' C. E. Garside: 'Devine *Misery and its Causes*.' H. E. Egerton: 'Sainsbury *Court Minutes of the E. India Company* (1640–43).' F. M. Powicke: 'Davidson and Gray *The Scottish Staple at Veere*' (in Walcheren).

The Classical Review (Vol. XXIII. No. 8. December 1909. D. Nutt). J. M. Edmonds: 'The Berlin-Aberdeen Fragment of Alcaeus.' F. R. M. Hitchcock: 'Note on *Antigone*, 1216–18.' Query a parallel for 'Stone of rolling' (Ezra v. 8). W. Warde Fowler: 'Domaszewski *Abhandlungen zur Römischen Religion*.' H. C. Bell: 'Otto *Priester u. Tempel im hellenistischen Aegypten*.'

The Contemporary Review (Nos. 529–31. January–March 1910. Horace Marshall). R. F.: 'Fifty Years of Social Progress.' Sir A. Fraser: 'Higher Education in India.' H. Grierson: 'Shakespeare and the Sea.' G. K. Chesterton: 'The Theology of Christmas Presents.' R. Roberts: 'Rudolf Eucken and St. Paul.' J. A. Hill: 'Automatic Writing.' 'The Flowers of Christ.' '*Cambridge History of English Literature*, IV.' 'Glover *Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire*.' 'H. C. Bradley *Oxford Lectures on Poetry*.' 'G. A. Abram *Social England in the XVth Century*.' 'Remacle *La Philosophie de S. S. Laurie*.' February. Y. Guyot: 'The Relations between the French Senate and Chamber of Deputies.' G. Whitelock: 'Italian and French Influence in English Pastoral.' J. Hammond: 'The Alleged Papal Charter—is it Authentic?' (St. Matt. xvi. 18. Reply (March) by Mgr. Barnes). O. M. B.: 'Prison Life as it affects Women.' R. Christie: 'The Dilemma of Theism.' E. A. Foord: 'East and West.' B. Chandra Pal: 'The Forces behind the Unrest in India.' M. Suddard: 'The Blending of Prose, Blank Verse and Rhymed Verse in *Romeo and Juliet*.' 'Rhys Roberts *Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Literary Composition*.' 'Gwatkin *Early Church History*.' 'Welton and Blandford *Principles and Methods of Moral Training*'; 'M. Higgs *The Evolution of the Child-Mind*.' 'Vivian *Campion's Works*.' 'Current Theological Books.' March. J. G. James: 'Faith, Fact, and Experience.' R. M. Bloch: '"Istar in the Underworld."' L. M. Phillipps: 'Stained Glass Windows.' C. T.: 'The Future of the Classics.' 'Sven Hedin *Trans-Himalaya*.' '*Joseph Bevan Braithwaite*.' 'H. G. Doughty *The Cradle of New France*.' '*Lord Kelvin's Early Home*.' 'H. Begbie *Broken Earthenware*.' 'Henson *Liberty of Prophesying*.' '*Temple Dictionary of the Bible*.' 'Chadwick *Social Relationships*.' 'W. Temple *The Faith and Modern Thought*.'

Revue Biblique Internationale (N.S. Vol. VII. No. 1. January 1910. Paris: Lecoffre). M. J. Lagrange: 'Le but des paraboles d'après l'Évangile selon St. Marc.' M. R. Savignac: (1) 'La conquête de Jéricho

(Jos. vi. 1–20)'; (2) 'Visite aux fouilles de Samarie. À travers les nécropoles de la montagne d'Éphraïm' (illustrated). P. Dhorme: 'Les pays bibliques et l'Assyrie.' Mgr. G. Mercati: 'Un supposto frammento di Origene.' In cod. Vindob. Suppl. gr. 4. J. David: 'Fragments de l'Évangile selon St. Matthieu en dialecte moyen-égyptien.' F. M. Abel: 'Une croisière à la mer Morte' (*suite*) (illustrated). H. V[incent]: (1) 'À propos des fouilles de Samarie'; (2) 'Une concession funéraire archaïque.' M. J. Lagrange: 'Reinach *Orpheus*' (13 pp. critical). P. D[horme]: 'Ungnad-Ranke *Altorientalische Texte u. Bilder zum A.T.*'; 'Valbuena *La Arqueologia greco-latina ilustrando el evangelio*'; 'E. A. Abbott *Message of the Son of Man*'; 'Spitta *Jesus u. die Heidenmission*'; 'Camerlynck *Commentarius in epistolas catholicas*'; 'Belser *Die Epistel des hl. Jakobus*'; 'Standt *The Idea of the Resurrection in the ante-Nicene Period*'; 'Hart *Ecclesiasticus*'; 'Peake *Religion of Israel*'; 'S. A. Cook *Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Second Millennium B.C.*'

Revue de l'Orient Chrétien (Vol. XIV. No. 4. 1909. Paris: 20, rue du Regard). R. Griveau: 'Notices des MSS. arabes chrétiens entrés à la Bibliothèque Nationale depuis la publication du catalogue,' III. F. Nau: (1) 'Histoires des solitaires égyptiens,' VI (MS. Coislin 126 ff 216 *sqq.*); (2) 'La naissance de Nestorius'; (3) 'Cinq lettres de Jacques d'Édesse à Jean le Stylite (traduction et analyse).' L. Leroy: 'Histoire d'Abraham le Syrien, patriarche copte d'Alexandrie (texte arabe, traduction française).' From MS. Paris. Syr. 65. S. Grébaut: (1) 'Vie de Barsoma le Syrien (texte éthiopien, traduction française),' IV; (2) 'Barsoma le Syrien d'après le synaxaire éthiopien (traduction).' From MS. Paris. Ethiop. 126. L. Delaporte: (1) 'Catalogue sommaire des MSS. coptes de la Bibliothèque Nationale,' I; (2) 'Le "fondement" de l'année d'après la chronographie d'Élie de Nisibe.' F. Nau: 'Ballerini *Les premières pages du pontificat du pape Pie IX.*' E. Tisserant: 'Charon *Histoire des Patriarcats Melkites*, III.' M. A. Kugener: 'Sachau *Syrische Rechtsbücher.*'

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique (Vol. XI. No. 1. January 1910. Louvain). J. Flamion: 'Les actes apocryphes de Pierre,' V. J. de Ghellinck, S.J.: 'Le traité de Pierre Lombard sur les sept ordres ecclésiastiques: ses sources, ses copistes,' III. F. Bliemetzrieder: 'Conclusions de Guillaume de Salvarvilla, maître en théologie, à Paris, sur la question du concile général pendant le grand schisme d'Occident (1381).' P. Richard: 'Origines et développement de la secrétairerie d'État apostolique' (1417–1823).' E. Tobac: 'Fonck *Die Parabeln des Herrn im Evangelium.*' C. Martens: 'Combarieu *La musique et la magie.*' J. Lebon: 'Delehaye *Les légendes grecques des saints militaires.*' C. Baur: 'P. F. de' Cavalieri *Hagiographica*'; '*Chrysostomika*, II-III'; 'Vogt *Basile Ier, empereur de Byzance* (867–86).' J. Flamion: 'Lebon *Le monophysisme sévérien*' (7½ pp.). J. Warichez: 'Parisot *Les origines de la Haute-Lorraine et sa première maison ducale* (959–1033).' J. de Ghellinck: 'Schmoll *Die Busslehre der Frühscholastik.*' L. Dieu: 'Robert *Les écoles et l'enseignement de la théologie pendant la première moitié du XIIe siècle.*' G. Mollat: 'Bliemetzrieder *Literarische Polemik zu Beginn des grossen abendländischen Schismas.*' T. H. von Oppenraaij: 'Berbig *Spalatin u. sein verhältnis zu Luther*'; 'Cramer-Pijper *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica*, V' (6 pp.); 'Hegler-Köhler *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Mystik in der Reformationszeit.*' A. Pasture: 'Ancel *La disgrâce et le procès des Carafa* (1559–67)'; 'Venturi *Storia della Campagnia di Gesu in Italia*'; 'Schmidlin *Die Kirchlichen Zustände in Deutschland vor dem dreissigjährigen Kriege. I. Oesterreich*' (5½ pp.). P. Richard: 'Lavisse *Histoire de France*, VII–VIII, 1' (9 pp.). C. Terlinden: 'Bloch *L'assistance et l'État en France* (1764–90)' (10 pp.). 'Burn *Facsimiles of the Creeds.*' P. de P[uniet]: 'Connolly *Liturgical Homilies of Narsai.*'

Revue des Questions Historiques (Vol. LXXXVII. No. 173. 1910. Paris:

5, rue Saint-Simon). V. Ermoni: 'Le Marcionisme.' G. Baguenault de Puchesse: 'Georges Picot, historien.' A. Degert: 'L'Enseignement de l'histoire dans les anciens séminaires français.' M. Dubruel: 'La congrégation particulière de la Régale sous Innocent XI et les papiers d'Agostino Favoriti et de Lorenzo Casoni aux archives vaticanes.' J. Guiraud: 'Fayen *Analecta Vaticano-Belgica*, II. *Lettres de Jean XXII*'; 'Rieder *Römische Quellen zur Konstanzer Bistums-geschichte* (1305–78)'; Verga *L'Archivio della fabrica del Duomo di Milano*'; 'Fedeli *I documenti pontifici riguardanti l'Universita di Pisa*'; 'Kleinclausz *Histoire de Bourgogne*.' L. Mirot: 'Delachenal *Histoire de Charles V*.' C. Boutard: 'Ollivier *L'Empire libéral*.' H. Froidevaux: 'Helmolt *Weltgeschichte*, IX.' R. Lambelin: 'Combarieu *La musique et la magie*'; 'Waddington *La guerre de Sept Ans*, IV'; 'Clémenceau *Histoire de la guerre de Vendée* (1793–1815)'; 'Baddeley *Russian Conquest of the Caucasus*.' M. Besnier: 'Barker *Buried Herculaneum*'; 'Allard *St. Sidoine Apollinaire* (431–89)'; 'Monteyer *La Provence du Ier au XIIe siècle*.' 'Cabrol *L'Angleterre chrétienne avant les Normands*'; 'Hampe *Deutsche Kaisergeschichte im Zeitalter der Salier u. Staufer*.' E. Jordan: 'Scharnagl *Der Begriff des Investitur*.' G. Péries: 'Kreutzer *Zwinglis Lehre von Obrigkeit*'; 'Granderath *Geschichte des vatikanischen Konzils*, III.' M. Sepet: 'Lang *The Maid of France* and *La Jeanne d'Arc de M. Anatole France*.' A. Vogt: 'Piaget *Documents inédits sur la Réformation dans le canton de Neuchatel*, I (1530–38).' Y. de la Brière: 'Simar *Erycius Puteanus* (1571–1646)'; 'Bert *Histoire de la révocation de l'édit de Nantes à Bordeaux* (1653–1715).' E. G. Ledos: 'Besse *Abbayes et prieurés de l'ancienne France*, II'; 'de Grandmaison *La bienheureuse Mère Barat* (1779–1865).' L. G. P[élissier]: 'White-Mario *Della Vita di Mazzini*'; 'Leblond *Documents pour servir à l'histoire de Beauvais au XVIe siècle*.' J. Viard: 'Uzureau *Andegaviana* VIII'; 'Bardet *Archives historiques du Poitou*, XXXVI–VII'; 'Degert *Gallia Christiana novissima. Histoire des évêques d'Aire*.' 'Saulnier *Le parlement de Bretagne* (1554–1789).'

Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuses (N.S. Vol. I. No. 1. January-February 1910. Paris: É. Nourry). A. Loisy: 'La notion du sacrifice dans l'antiquité israélite.' F. Cumont: 'La propagation du manichéisme dans l'Empire romain.' C. Michel: 'Le culte d'Esculape dans la religion populaire de la Grèce ancienne.' M. Hebert: 'Toutain *Études de mythologie et d'histoire des religions antiques*'; 'Reinach *Orpheus*'; 'Hubert-Mauss *Mélanges d'histoire des religions*'; 'Foucart *La méthode comparative dans l'histoire des religions*'; 'Van Gennep *Les Rites de passage*'; 'Daehnhardt *Natursagen*, I. *Sagen zum A.T.*' (4 pp.); 'Saintyves *Les saints successeurs des dieux*' et '*Les vierges mères et les naissances miraculeuses*'; 'Wernle *Einführung in das theologische Studium*'; 'Le Roy *La religion des primitifs*.' A. Loisy: 'Warneck *Die Religion des Batak*'; 'Erman *Die ägyptische Religion*'; 'Thompson *Semitic Magic*'; 'Schrank *Babylonische Sühnriten*'; 'S. A. Cook *Religion of Ancient Palestine*'; 'Gressmann *Die Ausgrabungen in Palästina u. das A.T.*'

Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie (Vol. XXXIV. No. 1. 1910. Innsbruck). J. Stiglmayr: 'Das *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*. Zur Frage über Grundsprache, Entstehungszeit, Heimat u. Verfasser des Werkes.' F. Lauchert: 'Der italienische Franziskaner J. A. Delphinus u. die Beziehungen seiner literarischen Tätigkeit zum konzil von Trient.' E. Dorsch: 'Aphorismen u. Erwägungen zur Beleuchtung des "vorirenäischen" Opferbegriffs.' H. Wiesmann: 'Die Einführung des königtums in Israel (1 Sam. viii–xii).' J. Stufler: 'Grabmann *Die Geschichte der scholastischen Methode*.' H. Hurter: 'Pesch *Theologische Zeitfragen*, IV–V.' E. Michael: 'Pastor *Geschichte der Papste*, V'; 'Hergenröther-Kirsch *Handbuch des allgemeinen kirchengeschichte*, vierte Auflage.' J. Linder: 'Egger *Absolute oder relative Wahrheit der hl. Schrift?*'; 'Innitzer *Johannes der Täufer*.' U. Holzmeister: 'Mayer *Die Schatzung*

bei Christi Geburt.' J. Biederlack: 'Schindler *Lehrbuch der Moraltheologie*, II i.' A. Kröss: 'Fleischlin *Schweizerische Reformationsgeschichte*, I (1484–1529)'; 'J. G. Mayer *Geschichte des Bistums Chur.*' F. Krus: 'Willmann *Didaktik.*' (The late) S. Haidacher: 'Ps. Chrysostomus *Epistula ad monachos*' and 'Ps. Chrys. Homilie *De augusta porta et in orationem dominicam.*' J. Denk: 'Zur Itala.' F. Quadt: ''Subinductа mulier' (with authorities).

Theologisch Tijdschrift (Vol. XLIV. Nos. 1–2. 1910. Leiden: S. C. van Doesburgh). W. B. Kristensen: 'Over de godsdienstige beteekenis van enkele onde wedstrijden en spelen.' J. A. Bruins: 'Het Jezus-Christus-geloof. Een antwoord aan Dr. H. T. de Graaf.' M. Joustra: 'De zending in Nederlandsch-Indië.' K. Lake: 'Oudchristelijke Literatur.' No. 2. J. de Zwaan: 'De beteekenis van het Nieuwgrieksch voor den Theoloog.' K. H. E. de Jong: 'Spiritisme en Bijbelverklarung.' H. T. Obbink: 'Het Exodus-vraagstuk,' II. M. Wolff: 'Het Oordeel der Helleensch-Romeinsche schrijvers over oorsprong, naam en viering van den Sabbath.' J. J. P. Valeton, jr.: '"Wetens chappelijk en stichtelijk bederf? Pro domo."' A. v. Veldhuizen: 'Luk. viii. 47.'

Teologisk Tidsskrift (N.S. Vol. I. No. 1. 1909. Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad). F. C. Krarup: 'Ihvilken Forstand er Kristendommen den absolute Religion.' C. Glarbo: 'Markus x. 17–18. En eksegetisk studie.' L. Bergmann: 'Heyck *Luther*'; 'Ebstein *Luthers Krankheiten*'; 'Anderssen *Die Franske Huguenotter* (1559–72)' and '*Billeder av Dannelsesarbejdets Historis.*' A. T. Jörgensen: '*Quellen u. Darstellungen aus der geschichte des Reformationsjahrhunderts*, III–VII.' R. Thomsen: 'Mott *The future Leadership of the Church*' (5½ pp.).

The Church Missionary Review (Vol. LXI. Nos. 729–31. January to March 1910. C.M.S.). F. Baylis: 'Christian Churches in Moslem Lands,' I (II, Feb.). G. F. Smith: 'The Liquor Trade in S. Nigeria,' I (II, March). 'Eskimo Work in Baffin's Land. Rev. E. J. Peck's Journal.' R. Keable: 'The Cambridge University Missionary Campaign.' 'G. C. Morgan *The Missionary Manifesto.*' February. E. R. McNeile: 'Young India and the Education of Girls.' D. H. D. Wilkinson: 'The Changing East and the Training of Missionaries.' W. Hooper: 'Missionary Policy.' G. T. Manley: 'Devotion and Strategy in Foreign Missions.' Church Congress Paper, 1909. C. D. Snell: 'Machray *Life of Robert Machray, Archbishop of Rupert's Land*' (10 pp.). E. Howard: 'Hackmann *Buddhism as a Religion*' [E.T.]. 'W. O. Carver *Missions in the Plan of the Ages.*' 'McIntyre *The Spirit in the Word.*' March. H. Morris: 'The Relation of Missions to Governments. The Subject of Inquiry by Commission VII of the World Missionary Conference, 1910.' H. G. Grey: 'Old Truths re-vindicated. I. Justification by Faith.' Right Rev. G. A. Lefroy (Bishop of Lahore): 'Services rendered by Mission Colleges in India.' Speech at Peshawar, Jan. 1910. 'Bishop Ingham in Hong Kong.' 'Anti-Opium Efforts in China. I. Memorandum from Bishop Price to the Archbishop of Canterbury. II. Letter from the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to the Archbishop.' T. R. W. Lunt: 'Children who hope to be Missionaries. How to help them.' E. Howard: '*The Path of Light. A Manual of Mahā-yāna Buddhism*,' [E.T].

The East and the West (Vol. VIII. No. 29. January 1910. S.P.G.). E. W. Capen: 'Mission Education and the Far East.' Ven. A. Ward: 'The Druzes and their Religion.' E. Greaves: 'India for the Christian Church or for Christ?' G. W. Rawlings: 'Agnosticism in Japan.' R. F. Callaway: 'Colour Antipathies. A Study of the Conditions of Church Life in S. Africa.' K. A. H. Houghton: 'The Problem of Bantu Education in S. Africa.' C. H. Robinson: 'The Interpretation of the Character of Christ to the Non-Christian World.' 'Bp. Montgomery *Visions.*' '*Canada's Missionary Congress*, 1909. *Addresses.*' 'Machray *Life of*

Archbishop Machray.' 'Lagden *The Basutos.*' 'Wirgman *Life of James Green, Dean of Maritzburg.*' 'E. Stock *My Recollections.*' 'F. E. Carter *Preaching.*' 'A. T. Mahan *The Harvest Within.*' '*Letters of M. Elizabeth Hayes, M.B.*'

Books Received.

The more important will be reviewed in Short Notices or Articles as space permits.

Biblical and Kindred Studies.

Alexander, G.—*The Epistles to the Colossians and to the Ephesians.* 'Bible for Home and School.' Pp. x + 132. (Macmillan.) 2*s.* 6*d.*

Buonaiuti, E.—*Saggi di Filologia e Storia del Nuovo Testamento.* 'Manuali di Scienze Religiosi, N. 2. Seconda Edizione. Pp. 248. (Roma: Ferrari.)

Gowen, H. H.—*An Analytical Transcription of the Revelation of S. John the Divine.* With Introduction, Brief Commentary and a Dictionary of Apocalypse. Pp. xiv + 268. (Skeffington.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net. By the Lecturer on Oriental Literature at the University of Washington.

King, H. C.—*The Ethics of Jesus.* 'New Testament Handbooks.' Pp. xiv + 294. (Macmillan.) 6*s.* 6*d.* net. The 'W. B. Noble' Lectures at Harvard, 1909, by the President of Oberlin College.

Knight, W.—*The Golden Wisdom of the Apocrypha.* With Explanatory Preface, and an Appendix containing some of the Proverbial Wisdom of the Talmud. Pp. 64. (Oxford: Blackwell. London: Simpkin, Marshall.) 2*s.* net.

McComb, S.—*The Making of the English Bible.* Pp. xiv +188. (New York: Moffat, Yard and Co.)

Plummer, A.—*An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Matthew.* Second Edition. Pp. xiv + xlvi + 452. (Elliot Stock.) 12*s.*

Proby, W. H. B.—*Notes on the Revelation of St. John.* To which is appended 'Scoffers' Objection Considered' in a Sermon. Pp. xxvi + 162. (Nisbet.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Savage, Very Rev. H. E. (Dean of Lichfield).—*The Gospel of the Kingdom: or the Sermon on the Mount considered in the Light of Contemporary Jewish Thought and Ideals.* Pp. xviii + 274. (Longmans.) 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Thompson, J. M.—*The Synoptic Gospels arranged in Parallel Columns.* Pp. xxviii + 162. (Clarendon Press.) 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Westphal, A.—*The Law and the Prophets, or, the Revelation of Jehovah in Hebrew History from the Earliest Times to the Capture of Jerusalem by Titus.* Being the work entitled *Jehovah* translated and adapted by C. Du Pontet. With a Foreword by the Bishop of Winchester. Pp. xxviii + 458. (Macmillan.) 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

Whitham, A. R.—*The Life of our Blessed Lord.* From the Revised Version of the Four Gospels, with Explanatory Notes. Pp. xvi + 364. (Rivingtons.) 3*s.* 6*d.*

Wiener, H. M.—*Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism.* Pp. xvi + 240. (Elliot Stock.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net. Reprinted from *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1908 1909.

The New Testament in the Revised Version of 1881 *with Fuller References.* Pp. xxii + 634. (Frowde.) 6*s.* net.

Biblical and Dogmatic Theology.

Adams, J.—*Israels' Ideal, or Studies in Old Testament Theology.* Pp. xii + 232. (T. and T. Clark.) 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Briggs, C. A.—*Church Unity. Studies of its most important Problems.* Pp. xiv + 460. (Longmans.) 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Downer, A. C.—*The Mission and Ministration of the Holy Spirit.* Pp. xxx + 348. (T. and T. Clark.) 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Hall, F. J.—*Evolution of the Fall.* 'Bishop Paddock' Lectures, 1909–10. Pp. xviii + 226. (Longmans.) 5*s.* net.

Malden, R. H.—*The Athanasian Creed.* Pp. 26. (S.P.C.K.) 2*d.*

Meschler, M. (S.J.)—*Jésus. Quelques traits de la Physionomie morale de Jésus. L'Enseignement ascétique de Notre-Seigneur; La Pédagogie de Notre-Seigneur; Jésus dans ses Relations avec les Hommes; Prédication de Notre-Seigneur au point de vue didactique et oratoire.* Traduit de l'allemand par l'abbé C. Lamy de la Chapelle. Pp. 172. (Paris: Beauchesne.) 1 *fr.* 50. Ouvrage approuvé par Sa Grandeur Mgr. L'Archevêque de Fribourg en Brisgau.

Oesterley, W. O. E.—*The Jewish Doctrine of Mediation.* Pp. viii + 240. (Skeffington.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Oldroyd, J. B.—*The Doctrine of the Atonement, chiefly as set forth in the Epistle to the Hebrews.* With Preface by Canon Body. Pp. 78. (Elliot Stock.) 2*s.* net.

Schweitzer, A.—*The Quest of the Historical Jesus: a Critical Study of its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede.* Translated by W. Montgomery. With a Preface by F. C. Burkitt. Pp. x + 410. (A. and C. Black.) 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Philosophy of Religion and Apologetics.

Abt, E. (S.J.)—*Une Conversion de Protestants par la Sainte Eucharistie. Autobiographies.* 'Apologétique vivante,' No. 4. (Paris: Beauchesne.) 80 *c.*

Edghill, E. A.—*Faith and Fact: a Study of Ritschlianism.* Being the Essay for the Norrisian Prize, 1908. With Preface by the Bishop of Southwark. Pp. xxiv + 272. (Macmillan.) 5*s.* net.

Gerrard, T. J.—*The Wayfarer's Vision.* Pp. xxiv + 284. (Burns and Oates.) 5*s.* net.

Hickson, J. M.—*The Dangers of Christian Science.* With Preface by the Headmaster of Eton. Pp. 16. (Mowbray.) 3*d.* net.

Joyce, G. C.—*The Inspiration of Prophecy: an Essay in the Psychology of Revelation.* 'S. Deiniol's Series,' I. Pp. viii + 195. (Frowde.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Mangenot, E.—*La Résurrection de Jésus.* Suivie de deux Appendices sur la Crucifixion et l'Ascension. 'Bibliothèque Apologétique,' No. 9. Pp. 404. (Paris: Beauchesne.) 3 *fr.* 50. By the Professor of Holy Scripture at the Institut Catholique de Paris.

Mercer, Right Rev. J. E. (Bishop of Tasmania).—*The Science of Life and the Larger Hope.* Pp. vi + 196. (Longmans.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Mozley, J. K.—*Ritschlianism. An Essay.* Pp. x + 274. (Nisbet.) 5*s.* net. 'Norrisian Prize,' 1908.

Temple, W.—*The Faith and Modern Thought.* Six Lectures. Pp. xii + 172. (Macmillan.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net. With Introduction by Prof. M. E. Sadler.

Comparative Religion and Folklore.

Bevan, J. O.—*Egypt and the Egyptians: their History, Antiquities, Language, Religion, and Influence over Palestine and Neighbouring Countries.* With Preface by Sir G. H. Darwin, K.C.B., F.R.S. Pp. xxii + 324. (George Allen.) 5*s.* net.

DeGroot, J. J. M.—*The Religion of the Chinese.* Pp. viii + 230. Macmillan.) 5*s.* net.

HANAUER, J. E.—*Folk-Lore of the Holy Land, Moslem, Christian and Jewish.* Edited by M. PICKTHALL. Pp. xxii + 326. (Duckworth.) 5*s.* net.

JORDAN, L. H.—*Comparative Religion. A Survey of its recent Literature.* Second Section, 1906–9. Pp. 72. (Edinburgh: Schulze.)

KER, A.—*Papuan Fairy Tales.* Pp. xii + 150. (Macmillan.) 5*s.* net.

KING, I.—*The Development of Religion: a Study in Anthropology and Social Psychology.* Pp. xxiv + 372. (Macmillan.) 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

LAWSON, J. C.—*Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion: a Study in Survivals.* Pp. xii + 620. (Cambridge University Press.) 12*s.* net.

NAVILLE, E.—*The Old Egyptian Faith.* Translated by C. CAMPBELL. 'Crown Theological Library,' Vol. XXX. Pp. xx + 322. (Williams and Norgate.) 5*s*

SMITH, S. G.—*Religion in the Making: a Study in Biblical Sociology.* Pp. viii + 254. (Macmillan.) 5*s.* net. By a Professor in the University of Minnesota.

STEVENSON, M.—*Notes on Modern Jainism.* With Special Reference to the S'veta'mbara, Digambara and Stha'nakava'si Sects. Pp. viii + 126. (Oxford: Blackwell. London: Simpkin, Marshall.) 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

UNDERWOOD, H. G.—*The Religion of Eastern Asia.* Pp. x + 268. (Macmillan.) 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

VIREY, P.—*La Religion de l'Ancienne Égypte.* 'Études sur l'Histoire des Religions,' 4. Pp. viii + 352. (Paris: Beauchesne.) 4 *fr.*

HISTORY AND ANTIQUITIES.

BLAXLAND, B.—*The Struggle with Puritanism.* 'Handbooks of English Church History,' Vol. V. Pp. xiv + 234. (Methuen.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

BURY, J. B.—*The Constitution of the Later Roman Empire.* 'Creighton Memorial Lecture,' delivered at University College, London, November 12, 1909. Pp. 50. (Cambridge University Press.) 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

FORD, E. A.—*Blessed Joan of Arc: Complete Story of her Wonderful Life, her Tragic Death, her Rehabilitation, her Beatification.* Pp. 314. (New York: Christian Press Association.) $1 net.

FRANÇAIS, J.—*L'Église et la Sorcellerie.* Précis historique, suivi des Documents officiels, des Textes principaux et d'un Procès inédit. Pp. 272. (Paris: É. Nouny.) 3 *fr.* 50.

HALE, M.—*Life of Reginald Pole.* Pp. xvi + 554. (Pitman.) 21*s.* net.

LATREILLE, C.—*L'Opposition religieuse au Concordat de 1792 à 1803.* Pp. xx + 290. (Hachette.) 3 *fr.* 50.

MACLEANE, D.—*Lancelot Andrewes and the Reaction.* Pp. xiv + 248. (G. Allen.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

PLUMMER, A.—*The Church of England in the Eighteenth Century.* 'Handbooks of English Church History,' Vol. VI. Pp. xii + 248. (Methuen.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

SUAN, P. (S.J.)—*Histoire de S. François de Borgia, troisième général de la Compagnie de Jésus* (1570–1572). Pp. 592. (Paris: Beauchesne.) 7 *fr.* 50.

POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY.

CHADWICK, W. E.—*Social Relationships in the Light of Christianity.* 'Hulsean Lectures,' 1909–10. Pp. xxii + 344. (Longmans.) 5*s.* net.

JONES, H.—*The Working Faith of the Social Reformer and other Essays* Pp. xii + 306. (Macmillan.) 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

NOEL, C.—*Socialism in Church History.* Pp. 284. (London: F. Palmer.) 5*s.* net.

The Church and Life of To-day. Pp. viii + 306. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 6*s.* Essays by the Bishops of Bristol, Durham, Barking, Lichfield, Croydon, Ely, Norwich (Sheepshanks), Jarrow, and Peterborough; Bishops Welldon and Ingham; the Deans of Norwich (Lefroy), Bristol, Chester, York, Peterborough; Archdeacon Norris; Canons Kempthorne, Rawnsley, Denton Thompson, Barnett, and Talbot; and the Headmaster of Eton.

LITURGICA.

SIMPSON, W. J. SPARROW.—*The Use of Vestments in the English Church.* Pp. 48. (Longmans.) 6*d.* net.

The Angelus and the Regina Caeli. With a few Short Notes, Explanatory and Historical. Pp. 16. (Longmans.) 6*d.* net.

The Hours of Prayer from Lauds to Compline inclusive. Compiled from the Sarum Breviary and other Rites. Pp. xxxvi + 354. (Mowbray.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net. Beautifully printed in clear type.

The Psalter of Jesus. Literally transcribed from the Sarum Primer of 1533. Pp. 24. (London: W. Knott.) 2*d.*

DEVOTIONAL AND PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

ALLIES, M. H.—*Leaves from St. Augustine.* Edited by the late T. W. ALLIES. Pp. xxviii + 412. (Burns and Oates.) 6*s.* net. A third edition, revised and enlarged, of Miss Allies' Translations, first published in 1886.

ARNOTT, H.—*Emmanuel. Brief Meditations on the Passion of our Lord.* Pp. 62. (Wells Gardner.) 1*s.* By the Rector of Beckenham.

BATE, H. N.—*The Healthful Spirit.* With Introduction by the BISHOP OF LONDON. Pp. xvi + 166. (Longmans.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

BAYLEY, G. J.—*The Church Catechism (dissected).* Pp. 20. (Woolwich: C. F. Thorn.) 1*d.* By the Vicar of Holy Trinity, Woolwich.

BEVAN, J. O.—*Exposition of the Collects, Epistles, and Gospels of the Book of Common Prayer alike of Sundays and Holy Days.* Pp. xxiv + 280. (G. Allen.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

BUCKLER, H. R. (O.P.)—*Spiritual Instruction on Religious Life.* Pp. viii + 178. (Burns and Oates.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

C., S. J.—*The Ministry of Angels.* Pp. 48. (Mowbray.) 1*s.* net.

CARRÉ, A.—*Pour l'Eucharistie.* Pp. 192. (Paris: Beauchesne.) 1 *fr.* 50. By a priest of the Diocese of Mans.

COHU, J. R.—*'Our Father' or the 'Lord's Prayer' viewed from a practical Standpoint.* Pp. xii + 176. (Oxford: Parker.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

CONYBEARE, F. C.—*The Ring of Pope Xystus, together with the Prologue of Rufinus.* Now first rendered into English with an Historical and Critical Commentary. Pp. vi + 138. (Williams and Norgate.)

DALTON, L. M. (the late).—*Chronicles of Cloister and Cave, being Eighty Texts illustrated in Anecdote.* Pp. viii + 140. (Skeffington.) Translated from the *Speculum Exemplorum* (1490) and *Magnum Speculum Exemplorum* (1611) by the late Vicar of St. Gabriel's, Canning Town.

ELLISON, J. H.—*Confirmation Papers.* Pp. 32. (S.P.C.K.) 4*d.* By the Vicar of Windsor.

FARTHING, G. R.—*Songs of our Pilgrimage: A Series of Poems on the Christian Year.* (Elliot Stock.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

HAMMOND, J.—*Magister moritur. A Contemplation of our Lord's Last Hours.* Pp. viii + 262. (Skeffington.) 5*s.*

HILL, RIGHT REV. R. (late Bishop of Sodor and Man).—*The Church Catechism, being Fifty-two Lessons for Bible-Class and Sunday-School.* Pp. viii + 246. (Nisbet.) 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

HOLMES, E. E.—*The Chalice.* Some Thoughts based on an Address to Members of the St. Paul's Lecture Society. Pp. x + 36. (Mowbray.) 6*d.* net. With eight beautiful Illustrations of famous Chalices.

HUGHSON, S. C.—*The Warfare of the Soul: Practical Studies in the Life of Temptation.* With Preface by A. G. MORTIMER. Pp. xiv + 216. (Longmans.) 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

JENKS, D.—*A Study of Meditation.* Pp. viii + 80. (Published for the Society of the Sacred Mission, Kelham, by A. R. Mowbray and Co. Ltd.) 1*s.* net. Fr. Jenks' little book will well repay study.

JERSEY, COUNTESS OF.—*Poems and Hymns for Young Children.* Part I. *Bible Stories in Verse.* Part II. *Hymns.* Pp. 94. (Wells Gardner.) 2*s.*

KING, RIGHT REV. E. (late Bishop of Lincoln).—*Meditations on the Seven Last Words.* Pp. 66. (Mowbray.) 6*d.* net. First published in 1874.

LEIGHTON, MOST REV. R. (formerly Archbishop of Glasgow).—*Rules and Instructions for a Holy Life* and *Prayers and Meditations.* Selected and edited, with an Introduction by J. DINWOODIE. With a Prefatory Note by the BISHOP OF DURHAM. Pp. xx + 64. (Longmans.) 2*s.* net.

PEAKE, A. S.—*The Heroes and Martyrs of Faith. Studies in the Eleventh Chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews.* Pp. xii + 210. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 5*s.*

PHILLIPS, S.—*A Faithful Servant.* Pp. viii + 80. (Wells Gardner.) 4*d.* 'To try and help those whom God has called to work hard, and have little time for reading.'

SHARPE, A. R.—*Holy Fear.* 'Heyford Papers,' No. 9. Pp. 64. (Mowbray.) 3*d.*

SMITH, J.—*The Life of Christ in Modern English.* For the Use of Schools. Compiled from the Gospels. Pp. 156. (Macmillan.) 6*d.* net.

STALLARD, A. G.—*Outlines of Lessons for the Use of Sunday School Teachers on the History of our Lord's Earthly Life.* Pp. iv + 108. (Mowbray.) 9*d.* net. By the late Curate of the Mission to Fishermen, Brixham.

W., H. L.—*Family Prayers for a Week. Chiefly from the Book of Common Prayer.* With Preface by the BISHOP OF SOUTHAMPTON. Pp. 44. (To be obtained from Messrs. Hugh Rees, Ltd., 119 Pall Mall, London.) 9*d.* An excellent little book.

WILSON, R. J.—*Before the Altar: The Devout Christian's Manual for Attendance and Communion at the Holy Eucharist, Sacrifice, and Sacrament.* Devotions adapted for the use of the Scottish Church, with a Summary of Faith, Instructions, Morning and Night Prayers, and Questions for Self-examination. Pp. viii + 148. (Mowbray.) 1*s.* net. Based on Dr. Challoner's Manual, by the former Warden of Keble.

WROTH, H. T.—*A Treasury of Thoughts on Prayer derived from famous Men of the Past Nineteen Centuries.* Pp. xiv + 176. (Elliot Stock.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net. From 97 different authors.

The Attributes of God mirrored in the Perfections of Mary. Pp. xvi + 204. (Burns and Oates.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

The Little Flowers of St. Francis of Assisi. India Paper Edition. Pp. 400. (Allenson.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net. A charming little edition of the translation by the Franciscan Fathers at Upton, revised by Mr. Thomas Okey.

SERMONS AND ADDRESSES.

BARDSLEY, J. W.—*Many Mansions and other Sermons.* Pp. xii + 360. (Nisbet.) 5*s.* net. By the former Vicar of Huddersfield.

BODY, G.—*The Good Shepherd.* A Series of Meditations. Pp. viii + 126. (Skeffington.) 2*s.* net. Notes of Addresses at a Retreat in Durham Cathedral.

BRETT, J.—*The Garden of God: Some Characteristics of the Spiritual Life mainly from the Song of Songs.* Pp. viii + 206. (Longmans.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

CREIGHTON, RIGHT REV. M. (late Bishop of London).—*Lessons from the Cross.* Pp. vi + 130. (Nisbet.) 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

EDEN, F. N.—*A Few Plain Words on the Apostles' Creed.* Given at the Services for Men at Rusthall. Pp. vi + 114. (Wells Gardner.) 2*s.* 6*d.*

MORTIMER, A. G.—*In the Light of the Cross: Addresses on the Last Seven Words of our Lord.* Pp. viii + 60. (Skeffington.) 2*s.* net. By the Rector of St. Mark's, Philadelphia.

NEWBOLT, W. C. E.—*Holy Marriage, being Four Lectures to Men.* Delivered in substance to Members and Friends of S. Paul's Lecture Society in the Crypt of the Cathedral during Lent, 1909. 'English Churchman's Library.' Pp. viii + 88. (Mowbray.) 1*s.* net.

ROBERTS, VERY REV. G. (Dean of Bangor).—*Salvation through Atonement.* Ten Instructions. Pp. iv + 108. (Mowbray.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

SEATON, J. B.—*The Comfort of the Holy Ghost.* Ordination Addresses With Preface by the BISHOP OF LONDON. Pp. viii + 74. (Wells Gardner.) 1*s.* 3*d.* net. By the Rector of St. Mary's, Johannesburg, late Vice-Principal of Leeds Clergy School.

SELBIE, W. B.—*Aspects of Christ.* Pp. viii + 280. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 6*s.* Chiefly Sunday evening sermons at Emmanuel Congregational Church, Cambridge, by the present Principal of Mansfield College.

SUYDER, A. W.—*Through the Forty Days.* Forty Lenten Addresses. Pp. vi + 166. (Skeffington.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

TEMPLE, MOST REV. F. (late Archbishop of Canterbury).—*Thoughts on the Divine Love.* Pp. 156. (S.P.C.K.) 2*s.*

TOWLE, C. S.—*The Seven Words from the Cross: A Set of Addresses.* Pp. x + 64. (Skeffington.) 1*s.* 6*d.* net. By the former Vicar of St. Clement's, Bournemouth.

WAKEFORD, J.—*Little Sermons on the Sunday Gospels: the Rainbow round the Throne.* Pp. viii + 280. (Longmans.) 5*s.* net.

WILLIAMS, J. H.—*Village Sermons for Lent.* Including Ash Wednesday, the Sundays in Lent, Good Friday and Easter Day. Pp. vi + 106. (Skeffington.) 2*s.* net.

WILSON, J. M.—*Four Lectures to Men on the Old Testament.* With Preface and Introduction. Pp. 72. (S.P.C.K.) 6*d.*

WILSON, S. (the late).—*Lenten Shadows and Easter Lights.* Pp. viii + 184. (Nisbet.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net. By the late Rector of Millbrook, Southampton.

The Royal Exchange in Advent: Three Addresses to City Men. By the BISHOP OF MANCHESTER, the BISHOP OF LONDON and BISHOP WELLDON. Pp. 28. (S.P.C.K.) 6*d.*

HOMILETICS.

SLATTERY, C. L.—*Present-day Preaching.* Pp. viii + 198. (Longmans.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net. Lectures at Berkeley Divinity School by the Rector of Christchurch, Springfield, Mass.

MISSIONS.

MALDEN, R. H.—*Foreign Missions: Being a Study of some Principles and Methods in the Expansion of the Christian Church.* Pp. viii + 256. (Longmans.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

ROBINSON, C. H.—*The Interpretation of the Character of Christ to non-Christian Races: An Apology for Christian Missions.* Pp. xvi + 200. (Longmans.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

TAIT, A. J.—*Christ and the Nations: An Examination of Old and New Testament Teaching.* Pp. xvi + 248. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 5*s.* By the Principal of Ridley Hall.

CLASSICAL STUDIES.

CLARKE, J.—*Physical Science in the Time of Nero.* Being a Translation